





Division BS2387

Section M 14

copy 1











*By the same Author*

---

**THE SPIRIT CHRISTLIKE**

---

*By the same Author*

*and others*

---

**THE OLD PURITANISM  
AND THE NEW AGE**

# Jesus and the Prophets

An Historical, Exegetical, and Interpretative Discussion of the Use of Old Testament Prophecy by Jesus and of His Attitude towards it :: :: ::

✓ By

Charles S. Macfarland, Ph.D. (Yale)

Minister of the Maplewood Congregational Church of Malden, Massachusetts

With an Introduction by

Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D., D.D.

Dean of the Divinity School of Yale University

G. P. Putnam's Sons  
New York and London  
The Knickerbocker Press

1905

COPYRIGHT, 1905  
BY  
CHARLES S. MACFARLAND

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

TO MY WIFE



“The spirit of the Lord Jahwe is upon me ; because Jahwe hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek ; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound ; to proclaim the year of Jahwe’s favor.”

ISAIAH lxi., 1, 2.

---

“ The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,  
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the  
poor :  
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives,  
And recovering of sight to the blind,  
To set at liberty them that are bruised,  
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. . . .”

“ To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears.”

LUKE iv., 18-21.

---

“ Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets :  
I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.”

MATTHEW v., 17.



## INTRODUCTION

THE most noteworthy and far-reaching contribution of the past quarter century to the scholarly yet reverent study of the Scriptures has been the unreserved adoption of the historical method of approach. When the Bible is viewed as a noble religious literature, the record in varied form of the gradual disclosure, through an historic people, of an adequate idea of God in His active relationship with the physical and moral universe, a new conception of its dominant value is sure to be developed. In place of an acceptance based upon its definite, unchanged transmission of the formulated declarations of God, there tends to grow up a reliance upon the Bible because it is a faithful transcript of the most pertinent human religious experience, reflecting all phases of the normal growth of a real consciousness of relationship with God and formulating successive approximations to eternal truth. The Bible becomes a manual of life rather than an authoritative digest of decisions.

This change of emphasis is not to be deplored. It does have the effect of making prominent the human element in the Bible, but only because the normal share of man in the revelation of divine truth has been overlooked in times past. It exhibits revelation as a progressing achievement, made more definite and final in character in proportion to the widening

experience and growing competency of its instruments. The prophets of the exile and later talked in terminology far nearer to that of the matured religious thinker of to-day than did those of the Assyrian conquest of the eighth century. The Israel of the later day was not only a sadder and more thoughtful people, but one far more enlightened and capable, prepared by bitter experience to realize the breadth of human need and the consequent greatness and goodness of God.

This progress of revelation is not exhibited to the historical student of the Bible as undefined. It rather appears as a steady development toward an anticipated culmination in the perfect revelation of God, given definition and illustration through the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, the Lord of all. Recognizing him as at once the goal of this recorded religious development and the standard by which it may at all stages be estimated, the student is only confirmed in his glad recognition of the whole course of previous history as an expression in some fashion of the active purpose of God, and in his high estimate of the value of the record preserved for our use.

This emphasis upon the historical method of approach to the Bible has thus directly led to a renewed enthusiasm for the investigation of two great problems. On the one hand, attention has been centred upon the historic Christ, Jesus of Nazareth. There is a great desire to know him at first hand, not merely through the loving vision of his earliest interpreters, but as he looked and spake and worked and thought. The end in view is not alone the purpose which is so well stated in the preface to the third Gospel, to secure an assured basis for faith in him as Lord, but the ability to get his point of view and his outlook upon the world.

On the other hand, the careful study of the personality and words of Jesus directs attention to the Old Testament which he rescued from a deadly formalism and reinterpreted as life and power. That which appealed to him as the quickening message of God can never be regarded as an antiquated record. Through his clear vision its testimony may be read afresh in its vitality and forcefulness. If he realized that the Old Testament Scriptures bore adequate testimony to all that he was to be and do, it sends us with renewed interest to a study of its pages.

An interesting detail of modern Biblical scholarship is the reversal of opinion which has taken place in regard to the foreshadowing in the Old Testament of the historic Christ. That he was anticipated is undeniable. "Art thou he that cometh?" was a natural query for a Jew to make. The exact method of his foreshadowing has been a matter of debate. In former times a student of Messianic prophecy sought diligently for specific declarations which clearly referred to the Christ. Often they have been forced to adopt unnatural canons of interpretation or to conclude that many of the prophetic writings contained nothing of Messianic significance. Yet, as we see to-day, it is truer than ever that all prophecy is Messianic, foreshadowing in some fashion the consummation that was to be. But the Messianic impulse was not satisfied by the mere description of some trait or act of Jesus. It was rather exhibited by contributions to the broadening of the religious outlook of the prophet's generation. Amos, for instance, says nothing specifically about Jesus or about the Christ, yet his message is definitely Messianic. His ethical emphasis forced a broader comprehension of the character of God and of His relations with the world; and

## Introduction

initiated an essential, even though an indirect, step in the formulation of the ideal of religious leadership which the right service of such a God would require. His vision was limited, but he was looking in the right direction. His successors could stand upon the summit which he reached and see far ahead. This view of prophecy makes it all Messianic. Even the denunciations of a Nahum find their place, for Nineveh was a great barrier to the realization of prophetic hopes.

Much of the justification of this broad interpretation of the Old Testament is to be found in the attitude of Jesus. He was the first free spiritual expounder of the Scriptures. His insight was keen and his judgment sound. With his interpretations the conclusions of reverent but scientific scholarship are in full harmony.

There is, then, a real reward in store for him who patiently studies the methods of Jesus in interpretation as revealed in his use of the Old Testament. This volume skilfully exhibits these methods without sacrificing, as so many of its predecessors have done, the religious value of the implied judgments. It brings before us on a basis of exact and adequate scholarship the secret of the vigorous spirituality and the unfailing enthusiasm of the Jesus of history. It will send the student with fresh eagerness to the prophetic writings which our Lord considered as an indispensable factor in his own religious growth, whose testimony to himself he accepted as direct and adequate.

F. K. S.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

March, 1905.

## PREFACE

THE author wishes to express his indebtedness to the lectures of Professors Frank C. Porter, Benjamin W. Bacon, Frank K. Sanders, Edward L. Curtis, and George B. Stevens of Yale University, and to the work done under the guidance of these eminent scholars and in association with them, during six years as a student and assistant in the theological and Biblical departments of that University. Free use has been made of material gathered in this way. To this has since been added the study of the teaching of Jesus in its application to the spiritual needs of men, during five years in the pastorate, in an effort to interpret Jesus in the light of those needs. The works mentioned in the Bibliography have been consulted in so far as they relate to the subject under discussion and the gathered result forms a considerable part of the contents of this work. The list given might be indefinitely extended. Free use has been made of commentaries and of other works than those mentioned. Special help has come from the works of Professor George Adam Smith, Holtzmann's *Handcommentar zum N. T.*, Wendt's *Lehre Jesu*, and Toy's *Quotations in the New Testament*. The Hebrew text of Baer and Delitzsch has been used and generally followed. In comparing with the Greek, Swete's edition of the Septuagint has been followed in most cases. The recent edition of the New Testament

in Greek by Nestle is the source of the quotations from the Gospels. The text has also been compared with Syriac versions, including the Sinaitic Palimpsest, but without any very noteworthy results. Wherever the author has not made his own English translation, the Revised Version has been followed.

CHARLES STEEDMAN MACFARLAND.

MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS,

January 1, 1905.

## CONTENTS

### CHAPTER I

	<small>PAGE</small>
INTRODUCTORY . . . . .	I
The Problem . . . . .	7
The Sources of the Gospels . . . . .	9

### CHAPTER II

QUOTATIONS FROM THE PROPHETIC BOOKS BY JESUS . . . . .	14
--	----

#### *1. Those Found in All Three Synoptists*

The Mustard Seed—Mark iv., 32; Matthew xiii., 32; Luke xiii., 19: from Daniel iv., 9 (12) . . . . .	15
The Fate of Prophetic Preaching—Mark iv., 12; Matthew xiii., 13-15; Luke viii., 10; John ix., 39: from Isaiah vi., 9, 10 . . . . .	18
At the Temple Cleansing—Mark xi., 17; Matthew xxi., 13, 14; Luke xix., 46: from Isaiah lvi., 7, and Jeremiah vii., 11 . . . . .	25
The Unworthy Husbandmen—Mark xii., 2; Matthew xxi., 33; Luke xx., 9: from Isaiah v., 1, 2 . . . . .	29
The Corner-Stone—Mark xii., 10, 11; Matthew xxi., 42; Luke xx., 17: from Psalm cxviii., 22, 23 . . . . .	39
The Challenge to Scribal Interpretation—Mark xii., 36, 37; Matthew xxii., 43-45; Luke xx., 42, 43: from Psalm cx., 1 . . . . .	43

	PAGE
The Divided Households—Mark xiii., 12; Matthew x., 35, 36; Luke xii., 52, 53; Matthew x., 21: from Micah vii., 6 . . . . .	51
<i>2. In Mark and Matthew</i>	
Jesus' Rebuke of Unreality in Worship—Mark vii., 6, 7; Matthew xv., 8, 9: from Isaiah xxix., 13 . . . . .	54
The Sheep Shall be Scattered—Mark xiv., 27; Matthew xxvi., 31: from Zechariah xiii., 7 . . . . .	57
<i>3. In Mark only</i>	
A Doubtful Passage—Mark ix., 48: from Isaiah lxvi., 24 . . . . .	61
<i>4. In Matthew and Luke</i>	
John the Baptist an "Elijah"—Matthew xi., 10; Luke vii., 27: from Malachi iii., 1 . . . . .	63
Judgment on Capernaum—Matthew xi., 23; Luke x., 15: from Isaiah xiv., 13-15 . . . . .	68
<i>5. In Matthew only</i>	
Mercy; not Sacrifice—Matthew ix., 13, and xii., 7: from Hosea vi., 6 . . . . .	70
<i>6. In Luke only</i>	
The Sermon at Nazareth—Luke iv., 18, 19: from Isaiah lxi., 1, 2. . . . .	73
The Stone of Stumbling—Luke xx., 18 (Matthew xxi., 44): from Isaiah viii., 14, 15. . . . .	84
Reckoned with Transgressors—Luke xxii., 37: from Isaiah liii., 12. . . . .	88
<i>7. In John only</i>	
God the Teacher—John vi., 45: from Isaiah liv., 13 . . . . .	94
An Unknown Reference—John vii., 38 . . . . .	97
A Skilful Defence—John x., 34: from Psalm lxxxii., 6	99
A Significant Interpolation—John xiii., 18: from Psalm xli., 10 (9) . . . . .	102
A Passage which Shows how Jesus did not Use Scripture—John xv., 25: from Psalm lxix., 5 (4) . . . . .	108

# Contents

xv

## CHAPTER III

	PAGE
SOME CONCLUSIONS WITH REGARD TO THE SOURCES AND TEXTS OF THE QUOTATIONS . . . . .	113
The Gospel Sources . . . . .	113
The Old Testament Sources . . . . .	115
The Gospel Renderings . . . . .	116
The First Gospel . . . . .	117
The Second Gospel . . . . .	118
The Third Gospel . . . . .	118
The Fourth Gospel . . . . .	118
Some Noteworthy Variations. . . . .	119
Formulas of Quotation . . . . .	121
Conclusion . . . . .	127

## CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF PROPHETIC PHRASES, TERMS, FIGURES, AND LANGUAGE BY JESUS . . . . .	129
In General . . . . .	129
In the Fourth Gospel . . . . .	135
Some Special Passages . . . . .	137
The Cry on the Cross . . . . .	140
Jesus' Use of the Book of Daniel . . . . .	143
The Apocalyptic Discourses . . . . .	144
Old Testament Terms . . . . .	153
“The Son of Man” . . . . .	154
“The Kingdom of God” . . . . .	158

## CHAPTER V

SOME ALLUSIONS, BY JESUS, TO THE PROPHETS AND TO PROPHECY . . . . .	165
The Triumphal Entry . . . . .	172
The Sign of Jonah the Prophet . . . . .	174

## CHAPTER VI

	PAGE
<b>JESUS' VIEW OF PROPHECY ; HIS CONCEPTION OF IT ; AND HIS RELATION TO IT. HIS IDEA OF FULFIL- MENT . . . . .</b>	179
1. Points of Contact in His Preaching and Teaching . . . . .	183
2. In His Sufferings and Lot . . . . .	187
3. In His Work . . . . .	188
His Choice and Use of Prophecy . . . . .	190
Applications to Himself . . . . .	192
His Standard of Value . . . . .	193
The Nature of Prophecy as understood by Jesus . . . . .	194
Jesus' Messianic Idea . . . . .	197
Fulfilment . . . . .	198

## CHAPTER VII

<b>COMPARISONS OF JESUS' VIEW OF PROPHECY . . . . .</b>	204
With the Rabbis . . . . .	204
With Philo . . . . .	211
With the Synoptists . . . . .	214
With the Fourth Gospel . . . . .	223
Some Further Comparisons . . . . .	227

## CHAPTER VIII

<b>JESUS' VIEW OF HIS BIBLE . . . . .</b>	235
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>	243
<b>INDEX . . . . .</b>	245

# Jesus and the Prophets



# JESUS AND THE PROPHETS

---

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

THE hesitating gleams of light beheld by ancient patriarchs and prophets became in Jesus the radiance of an eternal glow of which their vision was but the distant glimmering dawn ; and the preparing law of Moses and the prophets came to their divine completion in the grace and truth of Jesus Christ. In him God was with men, in the fulness of humanity uplifted to its prophetic and divine intention.

The supreme and sovereign personage of history is Jesus Christ. To grasp the magnitude of Jesus' person is the divinest task of human thought. For the intelligence of men he is the source of an exhaustless contemplation. The loftiest of human minds ought to be as humble as a child in his immeasurable presence, and with the wise men of the East bring but their homage, and at his feet cast their slight morsels of frankincense and myrrh and offer at his shrine the incense of their genius. This supreme Mind, whose words of holy wisdom have transformed our thought and life, knows no intellectual companions. Between

## Jesus and the Prophets

him and the intellects of loftiest reach there is a great gulf fixed. His greatness, unencompassed by the mind of man, calls for the heart. For the interpretation of his ineffable, transcendent person, only the clearness of a pure heart suffices. The attitude of men to Jesus is the final and determining computer of their length and height and breadth of vision and of life.

He is the way, the truth, the life of men. They walk in holy paths, become their own true selves, and only truly live, in the larger, deeper meaning of their life, as they interpret him in thought, are moved to worship in his incomparable presence, and follow him in life. His way of truth becomes the path of life.

All our upliftings of the moral ideal, of our discoveries of goodness, are but the mind of Christ translated to the minds of men.

To recover his unutterable vision is the loftiest aim of human mind and heart. To see his God, to grasp his interpretation of our own souls is the supreme achievement set before the race. His consciousness, so far as gained, is its superlative possession. To know Jesus Christ would be to reach the height and depth of spiritual knowledge. His association with the Infinite was an ideal, unique, transcendent, ineffable, and unsearchable relation.

And the reverent man who seeks, as men will seek, and ought to seek, an adequate interpretation of Jesus to the intellect—be at the same time his heart and motive pure—will find himself lifted beyond the humanity in which he stands, will find himself upon the height of Tabor, gazing at a countenance transfigured before him, at a face which shines as the sun, at garments white as the light; while the cloud of a divine glory overshadows him, and in his ears resounds the

voice, "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him." The God of Jesus is the highest reach of human thought. The Jesus of God knows nothing higher, and he that hath seen him hath seen the Father.

To apprehend the moral magnitude and contemplate the spiritual force of Jesus is the solitarily supreme desire of the mind of man, and to appropriate his life the loftiest endeavor of a human soul. In him the Infinite is reachable to human contemplation. He is God with us. Through him attainable to human aspiration, he is God within us. The Son of God, the witness and the earnest of the heavenly childhood of the race, he is the sovereign possession of mankind.

He is infinitely above and beyond all creeds, confessions, traditions, and bibles.

The teachings of Jesus present for the student of theology the loftiest theme for investigation in all the vast realm of Biblical study and of philosophic thought. The "return" of our day to the teachings of Jesus we owe to our schools of learning. It is the result of the comparatively recent study of the theology of the Bible. But this itself may also be assigned to that mysterious movement in the life of the world, largely unaccounted for, defying analysis, but in which, under the guidance of the Spirit, new epochs begin. Our ways of thinking change and old faiths are seen in new lights. Our doubts lead us to Christ. The return to him is natural and inevitable, for he is the Teacher of teachers. We are always in danger of being misled by the interpretations of his fallible interpreters, and we must ever and anon scrutinize our ideas and conceptions in the light of Christ's own words and person. We must go back of the authority of the disciple to that of the Teacher himself.

In these days of controversy with regard to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and the nature and extent of their authority, it is a matter of the first importance that we should ascertain Jesus' view of the Scriptures and his method of interpreting them. The question as to how far the revelation in the Old Testament is of permanent value for the Christian Church must rest on its agreement or disagreement with the teachings of Christ. The same is equally true of the New Testament.

When Jesus began his mission in the world he did not altogether break with his time, nor with the past. He did not strive after absolute originality in his teachings. He found, at his hand, institutions and ideas upon which he could build. He came not to destroy these but to fulfil their ideals. Such was his attitude toward the Holy Scriptures. He accepted them as a revelation from God. He held these writings in deep reverence. He ascribes divine authority to them, in refuting the charges of his opponents, in condemning their practices, and in the establishment and defence of his own teachings. He refers to them as the "Word of God" (*see* Mark vii., 1-13). He meets the temptations of the adversary by Scripture: "It is written" and again "It is written." In teaching in the Temple his exposition of the Bible is such that his hearers exclaim: "How knoweth this man letters, never having been taught?" His teaching is rooted and grounded in it. He everywhere presupposes the Scriptures and their validity. When, in certain instances (*see* Matthew v., 21 *ff.*), he indicates their incompleteness and temporary character, or appears to diverge from them, it is on the ground of a distinction between their real, vital principle and that which is formal, local, and transitory.

With regard to the real, inner meaning he ascribes authority. He does not even disturb the letter except when abrogation of the letter executes the purpose of the spirit. He makes neglect of scriptural teaching, in this respect, a reproach to his opponents. "Did ye never read in the Scriptures?" and again: "Go and learn what they mean" (Matthew xxi., 42, and Matthew ix., 13).

While thus he is enabled to quote its teachings and to use its language freely, he is, in his interpretation of Scripture, free from the pernicious influences of his time. He appeals from a servile literalism to an interpretation which looks for truths and principles. While Jesus, as revealing God, was in a relation, not of opposition, but of continuation and consummation to the revelation which was before him, he does not altogether adopt the conception of that revelation which was dominant in his age. He went back of this to the more original and purer form of the ancient prophets and makes their teachings his starting-point. He begins with the Old Testament teaching and revelation.

Thus, just as Christianity grew out of Judaism and was its consummation, so the New Testament is built upon the Old. The two are in vital relationship. Both Old and New are in the same process of evolution. Being thus bound together, they explain each other. The Old is in the New. The New was in the Old. Through all the transition from Judaism to Christianity, the sacred volume of the nation retained authority as a divine revelation.

One important question is—How do the New Testament religious teachers deal with these writings? What is their attitude towards them and their method of interpreting them? A still more important question

(and not the same question) is—How did Jesus Christ regard them and use them?

In answering this latter question criticism has gone in three directions. 1. It has represented Jesus as more or less slavishly adopting the methods of his time. 2. It has not sufficiently recognized his dependence. 3. It has granted to Jesus an understanding and insight above that of his time, but has represented him as accommodating himself to his age and environment.

The last view, represented by such a writer as Renan,<sup>1</sup> has never gained currency. The world has been too certain of Jesus Christ as “the truth” to conceive of him as even *permitting* a “pious fraud,” as Renan represents. Those who hold to the second view do not sufficiently recognize Jesus’ dependence on the Old Testament as the foundation for his teachings; as his starting-point. They over-emphasize and misinterpret the nature of Jesus’ opposition to certain Old Testament teachings.

The tendency of the Church, influenced by the methods of using Scripture current with the apostolic writers, has inclined to the first. It has not sufficiently recognized the independence of Jesus and his elevation above his age. It has identified the method of the disciples with that of Jesus. The tendency has been, in Old Testament interpretation, to read Christ into the Old Testament, and especially into the prophets, in a very direct and literal way. So in New Testament

<sup>1</sup> See *Vie de Jésus*, chapter xv., page 245 *ff.* For example, Renan says, with regard to Jesus’ acceptance of the title, Son of David: “Le titre de ‘fils de David’ fut le premier qu’il accepta, probablement sans tremper dans les fraudes innocentes par lesquelles on chercha à le lui assurer. . . . Il se laissa donner un titre sans lequel il ne pouvait espérer aucun succès.”

interpretation, a like tendency has been to find, in the events of Christ's life, a very literal "fulfilment" of Old Testament prophecies, which then become predictions of the events.

To answer the question as to whether or not Jesus shared this view more than a mere casual reading of the Gospels is necessary. To decide whether or not the Evangelists were right in their methods of interpretation, we must go beyond the interpretation of these writers. We must find out for ourselves, so far as we can, just what Jesus actually said, just how much, and how, he himself used the prophets, and his main purpose in using them. To do this we need to make a thorough, critical, exegetical, interpretative study in the light of the historical occasion in each case.

### *The Problem*

There are two ways of looking at prophecy. One is to consider it as, primarily, prediction, and secondarily, preaching. Another way is to reverse this order. The conception of prophecy itself will determine the idea of its fulfilment. If prophecy is primarily the forecasting of special concrete events, then its fulfilment is something literal and detailed. If, on the other hand, prophecy is primarily truth, then its fulfilment will mean something more than that of the letter.

Which of these ways did Jesus regard as of supreme importance? Was he concerned with prophecy as prediction? Or was he concerned with prophecy as truth? Did he, first of all, conceive of the prophetic mission as the revelation of the thoughts and will of God; or was his first interest in it as a detailed prognostication of things which had relative moral insignificance? With regard to Messianic Prophecy: Was this to him the

forecasting of a hope of Israel's future as an ideal for the race, which ideal was realized in his Gospel? Or was he concerned with Messianic Prophecy as a series of definite descriptions with which he was to correspond in his earthly life?<sup>1</sup>

As we have already suggested, this is not identical with the question—How has the Church regarded prophecy? Nor—How did the early Fathers regard it? Nor—What did prophecy mean to the Evangelists and Apostles?

A study of the Gospels shows us that we have to deal with several independent sources in our record of Jesus' sayings. We find that they have not absolutely equal authority. Some are evidently more closely related than others to the subjects of which they treat. They are not always in entire agreement. The writers were moved by subjective considerations. Hence the teachings of Jesus are cast in different forms and are variously interpreted by these writers. We shall be obliged, if we are to get at the real sayings and teachings of Jesus, to go behind the form to the substance itself.<sup>2</sup> And

<sup>1</sup> On this, see, for varying views, Hühn, *Messianische Weis-sagungen*, I Teil, section 5, page 7; Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, Introduction; and Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, page 63 ff. Delitzsch is a good representative of a literal view. See his commentaries.

<sup>2</sup> In not recognizing the facts of critical scholarship we are led into serious errors. For example, a recent writer, speaking of the passage Matt. xv., 8, 9, remarks, in speaking of Jesus, “He forsakes the Hebrew and agrees with the Septuagint when it suits his meaning, and modifies even the version he is following” (Adamson, *The Mind of Christ*). Even a superficial knowledge of the facts of Jesus' life ought to prevent one from supposing that Jesus himself had anything to do with such a matter.

we must, in many cases, seek their meaning and application for ourselves independently of the interpretation of the Evangelists and editors.

We cannot enter upon a discussion of this kind without some presuppositions. These are based upon our conclusions with regard to what is known as "the Synoptic Problem." A settlement of this great question is by no means essential in order that we should get at the substance of Jesus' teaching. Inasmuch, however, as certain matters of detail depend on our view as to the mutual relationship existing between the sources of Jesus' teaching, we shall avoid needless and distracting divergences in our later discussion by suggesting our main points of view at the start.

### *The Sources of the Gospels*

It seems clear that two documents are at the basis of the synoptic tradition. One of these documents (Mark or an Original Mark) narrates chiefly the life of Christ. The other (*Logia*), mainly or entirely, his words, his teachings. The former best accounts for the likeness of statement in the incidents narrated in the Gospels. The *Logia* or "sayings" accounts for the likeness of expression and form in Christ's teachings. The second Gospel is more individual and independent than the others. It is probably the earliest. The likeness in form of the sayings in Matthew and Luke indicates the dependence of both on a *Logia*. Mark's narrative, also, was evidently used by the writers of the first and third Gospels. The similarity of Matthew and Luke is the result of this combination, in each, of the *Logia* with the Mark narrative. In Matthew and Luke we find the material from the *Logia* used by each in his

own way. In Matthew it is topically arranged, the historical connection being secondary. The writer of the third Gospel has evidently sought to give it its historical connection. Thus far, then, we find the first and third Gospels free and independent in the use of their common material.

The writer of the third Gospel evidently had, besides Mark and a *Logia*, an independent source. It does not seem probable that Luke used our Matthew or the same *Logia* that the writer of the first Gospel used. He had either a version of that *Logia*, or another *Logia* independent of Matthew's. He follows Mark's narrative in the main and endeavors to insert the *Logia* and the material from his third source into its historical connection. As to the second Gospel, it seems probable that it did not originally consist as we have it. An Original Mark has been used as the basis for our larger Mark.

These considerations must guide us, not altogether, but to some extent, when we are called upon to decide as to the original form of Jesus' words. In some cases we shall find it necessary also to determine the historical setting, the event with which the saying was connected, the hearers to whom it was spoken, in order to get its significance. In those matters the Evangelists do not always agree.

The fourth Gospel presents another, and a quite different problem. It seems probable that its writer presupposes the Synoptics and that he had a written source in addition. The fourth Gospel is not chiefly an historical account. It is concerned to give the teachings of Jesus and teachings about Jesus and not a simple narrative of events. In form, it seems certain that it does not correspond with the mode of speech

used by Jesus. Its form is that of its writer. He has to a considerable extent put Jesus' teachings into his own words. He did not quote Jesus, he explained him. His Gospel is a development of Jesus' teachings, and of his person, into doctrine. This Gospel contains very few *verbatim* sayings of Jesus.

We are led to further considerations. Were the writers of the Gospels influenced by subjective tendencies? We have seen that they were, as far as their formal method of presenting the life and teachings of Jesus is concerned. That is, some were historical, others concerned with ethical teachings, and others with doctrine. Furthermore, can we treat the question as to the substance and meaning of Jesus' words by an indiscriminate acceptance of what is presented to us? If we found that they were in entire agreement as to their interpretation, we might conclude that the Holy Spirit had given to these writers infallibility in thought and judgment. As a matter of fact, however, we find that while they do present a true picture, it is not a photograph. They do not always interpret or present in entire agreement. Just as the disciples in Jesus' lifetime sometimes misunderstood him, so the evangelical writers sometimes give his words a quite different turning and application from that of Jesus himself. This is where the main divergencies in the Gospels lie. These writers have not falsely presented Jesus' sayings; but they have in some cases given them their own application. This has occasionally led to change in expression. They had not the insight of Jesus himself, and they were, in contrast to him, limited considerably by their age and its influences.

One of these limitations lay in the requirement that a true Messiah must be proved such, from Old Testament

prophecies conceived of as predicting and describing him. The current method of proof was literal and mechanical. The writers of our Gospels were greatly influenced by this age-requirement in their interpretation of the events of the Master's life and of his teachings. To satisfy Jewish minds, their task was to establish his Messiahship by showing this detailed fulfilment of prophetic description. This being the conception of these writers, it was not unnatural that they should cast the sayings of Jesus in some such mould and give them such an interpretation and application. For example, when Jesus, in answer to the demand for a "sign," replied that there should be no sign given, but "the sign of the prophet Jonah" (Matt. xii., 39), a recorder of the incident saw in this a reference to the resurrection (verse 40), whereas this is not Jesus' meaning at all. In this matter we are not altogether concerned as to whether the Evangelists were right or wrong in their conception regarding these correspondences of prophecy to Jesus' life and work. Our question is—Was this the conception of Jesus? For our answer we must go back as far as we can to the actual words of Jesus himself, to his own use of prophecy. We must not interpret Jesus by the Evangelists. The reverse must be our process. The disciple is not above his master nor the servant greater than his lord. And we must not accord to the later Church any more authority as an interpreter that we allow the earlier Church and the Evangelists. Our investigation must be made by going back to Jesus' words and not by resting merely on a later, albeit widely accepted, meaning given to his words. The interpretation must determine and, if necessary, transform the doctrine, and doctrine must not be allowed to mould interpretation.

Our main task will be :

1. To set forth Jesus' use of prophecy.
2. To indicate his attitude towards it and the standard by which he valued it.
3. In the light of this, to show what its fulfilment signified with him, and how he regarded himself as the "fulfiller" of prophecy. Among the "prophetic" books we shall include the Psalms. They are so included when the Old Testament is spoken of as "Law and Prophets" and they have the genuinely prophetic character when we use that term in its truest sense.

## CHAPTER II

### QUOTATIONS FROM THE PROPHETIC BOOKS BY JESUS

WE shall first consider the direct quotations of Jesus from the Prophetic Books, including the Book of Psalms, and must refer to the Massoretic Text and to the Septuagint, in order to ascertain and to indicate the probable source of the quotations as we have them. Then the texts of the Gospels will be compared to enable us to learn the original form and expression. Wherever necessary, in order to determine the purpose of the quotation, its meaning and application, the historical occasion will be considered. Exegesis and criticism will be entered into only so far as needful to these ends. The significance of the passage in its Old Testament connection will be set forth, and then the use made of it by Jesus, and his purpose in citing it. In some cases passages will be treated which, while not direct quotations, are evidently consciously adopted from an Old Testament writing. The mere casual use of prophetic language and imagery, where the Old Testament connection is evidently of no special significance, will be reserved for consideration in a separate chapter. The passages will be discussed in the following order:

1. Those found in the three Synoptists.
2. In Mark and Matthew.

3. In Mark alone.
4. In Matthew and Luke.
5. In Matthew alone.
6. In Luke.
7. In John.

This arrangement is adopted, not because it necessarily prescribes any order as to the genuineness of the passages, but largely for convenience. Other versions than the Hebrew and the Septuagint will be given only where a comparison with such versions throws any light on the discussion.

#### I.—QUOTATIONS SUPPORTED BY MARK, MATTHEW, AND LUKE

##### *The Mustard Seed*

Mark iv., 32; Matthew xiii., 32; Luke xiii., 19: from Daniel iv., 9 (12). (Compare also Ezekiel xvii., 23, and Psalm civ., 12, 17.)

Aramaic—Daniel iv., 9: “And in its branches lodged the birds of heaven.”

Septuagint—“And in it the birds of heaven built their nests.”

Theodotion—“And in its branches the birds of heaven dwelt.”

Mark iv., 32—“. . . and putteth forth great branches so that the birds of heaven can lodge under its shelter.”

Matthew xiii., 32—“. . . so that the birds of heaven come and lodge in its branches.”

Luke xiii., 19—“. . . and the birds of heaven lodged in its branches.”

##### *The Parable*

Mark iv., 30-32—“And he said, How shall we liken the Kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the

earth, yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches ; so that the birds of heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof."

Matthew xiii., 31, 32—"Another parable set he before them, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field : which indeed is less than all seeds ; but when it is grown, it is greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof."

Luke xiii., 18, 19—"He said, therefore, Unto what is the Kingdom of God like? And whereunto shall I liken it? It is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his own garden ; and it grew, and became a tree ; and the birds of heaven lodged in the branches thereof."

The uncertain state of the Septuagint text of Daniel makes it difficult to trace the source of this quotation. Mark's "shelter" may relate to the similar word used in the previous clause in the Septuagint of Daniel iv., 9. Or it may be a reminiscence of Ezekiel xvii., 23, where the same phrase is used.

There is evidently some difference of conception by the Evangelists with regard to the closing words of the parable. Matthew and Luke say that it becomes a tree. Mark merely says that it becomes greater than all herbs. Matthew and Luke thus come nearer to the idea in the quotation itself, while Mark accommodates the quotation to the terms of the parable. Jesus would be more likely, where he was simply using an Old Testament phrase, without any direct connection of thought, to sacrifice the wording of the citation than the main idea of the parable.

Luke omits the reference to the smallness of the seed and mentions only the greatness of the tree. As to the setting, Matthew and Mark agree, and evidently their source is identical. This, however, is probably not the historical setting ; and Luke's is hardly more satis-

factory. Luke, in his emphasis of the largeness of the end to the exclusion of the smallness of the beginning, is probably influenced by his connection. Just preceding, in Luke, Jesus' triumph over his opponents is set forth. This suggested to Luke the idea of the ultimate victory and growth of Christ's cause and kingdom. This would suit the Gentile Gospel with its conception of Christianity as a world religion. In fact, in some codices and in the *Textus Receptus* we have "great tree." This reading, while rejected by the best texts, indicates Luke's exaggeration at this point, which is here carried a step farther.

Now when we come to consider the teaching of Jesus here, we see that his concern is not just this, but rather to forecast *development* in spite of the smallness of the beginning, than to prophesy future greatness. Losing sight of this, the third Evangelist, placing the parable in connection (verse 17) with a triumph of Jesus, and living in the time of its greatness, makes this a prophecy of the greatness of Jesus' coming kingdom.

As to Jesus' use of prophecy here—this is not a direct reference, nor should we treat it as a quotation were it not that some commentators have treated the passage as likening the coming kingdom in its growth to a great cedar of Lebanon (Ps. civ., 16), or to the great tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Such interpretations are forced. They fail to distinguish between allegory and parable. Jesus refers primarily to the smallness of the beginning as being no cause for discouragement. He merely borrows Old Testament figures of speech, by way of illustration.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the parable see especially Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden* (Zweiter Teil, vom Senfkorn und Sauerteig, sec. 48, p. 569).

*The Fate of Prophetic Preaching*

Mark iv., 12; Matthew xiii., 13-15; Luke viii., 10; John ix., 39: from Isaiah vi., 9, 10. (Compare also Mark viii., 18; John xii., 40.)

Hebrew—Isaiah vi., 9, 10: “And he said, Go and say to this people, Hear indeed, but understand not; and see indeed, but know not: make fat the heart of this people, and its ears make heavy, and its eyes smear, lest it see with its eyes, and hear with its ears, and its heart understand, and it turn again and be healed.”

Septuagint—“And he said, Go and say to this people, Hearing ye shall hear, but shall not at all understand; and seeing ye shall see and shall not at all perceive; for this people’s heart has become thick, and they have heard heavily with their ears, and have closed their eyes; lest perchance they should see with the eyes, and hear with the ears, and understand with the heart, and turn back and I heal them.”

## MATTHEW XIII., 10-17

10 And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? And he answered and said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to 12 them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even 13 that which he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables; because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither 14 do they understand. And

## MARK IV., 10-13

10 And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of 11 him the parables. And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: 12 that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them. And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?

(MATTHEW—*Continued*)

unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith,

By hearing ye shall hear,  
and shall in no wise understand;

And seeing ye shall see,  
and shall in no wise perceive:

15 For this people's heart is waxed gross,  
And their ears are dull of hearing,  
And their eyes they have closed;  
Lest haply they should perceive with their eyes,  
And hear with their ears,  
And understand with their heart,  
And should turn again,  
And I should heal them.

16 But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

## LUKE VIII., 9, 10

9 And his disciples asked him what this parable might 10 be. And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.

In the passage Mark viii., 17, 18, Jesus applies the words to the disciples, citing freely. In John ix., 39, the same idea is expressed in a different connection. It is probably a reminiscence from the Synop-

tists. In John xii., 37-41, the writer of the fourth Gospel himself cites the passage by way of comment.

We have here a considerably longer form in Matthew and a shorter in Luke, than that of Mark. Matthew, in this connection, brings together seven parables. The compiler follows his frequent custom of massing matter of the same kind. His evident purpose in doing so in this instance is effectually to impress the significance of this method of Christ's teaching as indicated by the purpose set forth in the quotation from Isaiah. As in other cases he adds the full quotation (Matt. xiii., 14, 15). It is altogether probable that this is an addition by the writer of the first Gospel. Mark and Luke (also John ix., 39) represent Jesus as merely giving the substance in a free adoption, as in Matthew xiii., 13. In Mark viii., 17, 18, where Jesus uses the same words in application to the disciples, they are rendered much the same as in Matthew xiii., 13. Matthew shows his interest to relate the matter definitely to prophecy as he does similarly later on, in xiii., 34, 35. John (xii., 37-41) seems to follow Matthew, influenced by the same purpose. It is to be noted that Matthew alone, of the Synoptists, represents it as "fulfilment." Mark and Luke merely represent Jesus as using the substance of the quotation in application to his hearers. Mark is evidently the most original.

In the whole matter there is a difference of understanding among the Evangelists. Matthew makes the question of the disciples refer distinctly ("therefore") to the method of teaching. Luke refers it to the meaning of the parables. In Mark the sense is ambiguous; they ask him concerning the parables. All three, however, represent Christ as teaching that he adopted this method to hide truth from unspiritual minds. They

seem to regard it as intention, and not merely as result. Luke and Mark represent Jesus as saying that he speaks in parables "in order that" they may not understand. Matthew endeavors to soften this and substitute "therefore," meaning "I speak this way—because—they see not, etc." But this does not altogether consist with verse 11—"Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, *but to them it is not given.*" The context shows that the same idea is present in all three accounts and it is not changed by Matthew's softening of "in order that" to "therefore." The fact that the difference between the words of Mark and Luke and the changed expression of Matthew corresponds to a similar difference between the Hebrew and the Septuagint<sup>1</sup> does not count for anything, inasmuch as it is evident that the Septuagint is the source of the quotation in all three accounts, and Matthew, in his addition, quotes it identically.

We shall arrive at an explanation of Jesus' use of the prophecy referred to by a comparison of the passage in Isaiah and by a consideration of the Parable of the Sower, which itself is an explanation of the use of the prophecy. Jesus explains what he means by this "hard saying" in his interpretation of the parable.

*The Prophet's Meaning (Isaiah vi., 9 ff.)*

Here the prophet is describing his commission from God. From its very nature we feel the necessity of placing the description in Isaiah's later life, written in the light of actual experience. The ideal character of this chapter, written some years after the events it

<sup>1</sup> In the Hebrew God sends His prophet to harden them. In the Septuagint the hardening is not purpose but result.

relates, is generally conceded. It is a picture of Isaiah's call and commission in the light of the results of his work. We cannot suppose that this conviction came to Isaiah at the opening of his work with all the awfulness with which it is here described. It was the conclusion of a long process of disillusionment and disappointment.

Seen thus, in the view of actual experience, the prophet's words become clear. The form of command "Go ye" is for emphasis and effect. This is frequently the prophetic way of stating a great principle with great emphasis. It accords with the Hebrew conception that all result has Jahwe as its cause. (See Amos iii., 6.) Result is identical with the divine purpose. In our passage Isaiah produces it, acting for God. Thus the prophet is stating here the actual effect of his work and preaching. It is the ironical utterance of bitter disappointment.

#### *Jesus' Use of the Prophet's Words*

This explains Jesus' use of the prophet's words. Similarity of situation and similarity of teaching suggest to him the language and expression, coming naturally and readily because of his familiarity with the Old Testament. Jesus is at a sufficiently advanced stage of his ministry to feel the keen disappointment of rejection and misunderstanding. He is at the height of his Galilean ministry, and with his keen insight and foresight he sees that hour just ahead, referred to in John vi., 66, when this Galilean ministry ended and from that time "many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him." He sees in the crowd around him the same hard unspiritualness depicted by

the prophet, with whose experience he was so familiar. He refers to the prophecy as a great principle or truth repeating itself in history. He realizes this darkening and hardening of the spiritual faculties as an inevitable result of his teaching. His meaning is, that truth such as his has not only the effect of saving and developing, but that it has also the effect of judgment and condemnation. To him that hath (that receiveth and useth) more is given. From him that hath not (that receiveth and useth not) is taken away that which he hath.

Again: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no excuse for their sin. . . . If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father" (John xv., 22-24).

These passages state the condemning power of Jesus' words and works. The same truth held good with Jesus as with Isaiah. Human nature used God's gifts for the opposite purposes for which they were given. "The evil heart can assimilate good to itself and convert it to its nature." Every successive preacher from Isaiah to Christ, and down to to-day, has experienced this same disappointment. Paul makes the same use of the passage in Isaiah that Jesus does, and under like circumstances (Acts xxviii., 26, 27), applying it to the passing of the Gospel over to the Gentiles. (See also Romans xi., 8, and 2 Corinthians iii., 14.)

That this is Christ's application is apparent from the parable in question and the explanation of it. The parable shows the cause and working of the principle embodied in the quotation. In this Parable of the Sower Jesus elaborates the idea, and is represented as

dividing the darkened and hardened into two classes, the spiritually dull, who see not at all; and those with darkened eyes who see but do not understand. He then sets over against these two classes a third who do hear and see. The parable itself forms a prelude to the discourse in which, through the prophetic language, Jesus warns the disciples against glowing appearances which would blind them to the weaknesses of humanity. Christ's parabolic teaching had especially done this hardening, because his parables required the use of spiritual insight. While they led on those who saw into them, they darkened those who did not. It was a fundamental conception of Jesus that men were not first to be convinced of his Messiahship and thus to become his disciples. The reverse must be the process. Receptiveness was the supreme requisite (*see* John x., 25 *ff.*). Thus he did withhold himself, in this sense, from those who did not become his disciples.

It does not seem as though the Evangelists saw Jesus' application of the prophecy in just this way. They express the hardening as the direct intention of the teaching. In this they are influenced by their interest in a literal fulfilment of prophecy. (*See* John xii., 37-41.) This was not Christ's concern. He uses the prophetic words for the setting forth of a great truth.

In Mark viii., 18 (compare Mark vii., 18, Matthew xv., 16), Christ refers to this when he asks, "Are ye also as blind as the throng outside?" In John ix., 39, he is represented as using the same passage from Isaiah in a similar way as in the passage we are considering. In John xii., 39-41, the writer of the fourth Gospel explains the hearers' unbelief in Jesus' signs as a literal fulfilment of the prophecy, adding (verse 41), "These

things said Isaiah, because he saw his glory: *and he spake of him.*”<sup>1</sup>

We find illustrated here that tendency of the Gospel writers to a literalization of the Old Testament passages which marks and mars their interpretation of Christ’s words. The writers of the first and fourth Gospels are misled by their effort to find in this a “fulfilment” of an Old Testament prediction. Jesus cares nothing for the matter in this sense. He uses the prophet’s words to state a truth and not at all to verify a prediction. If the reader will carefully compare Christ’s use of these words with the use of them by the Evangelist in John xii., 39-41, he will see the world-wide difference between Jesus and his interpreters. It is the difference between letter and spirit, between minute prediction and universal truth.

Paul (Acts xxviii., 25 *ff.*) uses this passage in the same way. Quoting the passage he says, “Well spake the Holy Ghost through Isaiah *unto your fathers.*” Then he adds: “Be it known therefore to *you* that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles; they also will hear.” He applies the words to his hearers in just the way Jesus had done.

### *At the Temple Cleansing*

Mark xi., 17; Matthew xxi., 13, 14; Luke xix., 46: from Isaiah lvi., 7, and Jeremiah vii., 11. (Compare John ii., 14 *ff.* and Jeremiah xxxii., 34.)

Hebrew—Isaiah lvi., 7: “For my house a house of prayer shall be called for all the nations.”

---

<sup>1</sup> On Jesus’ teaching regarding self-exclusion, the reader is referred to Wendt’s *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. i., page 109, note; and to vol. ii., page 81 *ff.* Also to Weiss’s *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, vol. i., page 130 *ff.*

Jeremiah vii., 11: "Has this house, in which my name is called, become in your eyes a den of robbers?"

Septuagint—Isaiah lvi., 7: "For my house a house of prayer shall be called for all the nations."

Jeremiah vii., 11—"Has this—my house—there where my name was called, become in your eyes a den of robbers?"

Mark xi., 17—"And he said to them: Is it not written, that, My house a house of prayer shall be called for all nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers."

Matthew xxi., 13, 14—"And he saith to them: It is written—My house a house of prayer shall be called, but ye make it a den of robbers."

Luke xix., 46—" . . . saying to them: It is written—And my house shall be a house of prayer,—but ye have made it a den of robbers."

These citations evidently follow the Septuagint. Abridgments and changes are made, which are necessary in order to give the quotation from Jeremiah the form of a direct charge against those to whom Jesus speaks. Mark alone repeats "for all nations." This may have been added later in order to make the quotation more nearly identical with the Isaiah passage. Or Matthew and Luke may have omitted it. It seems more probable that it is a later addition. While Matthew might not have any bias which would lead him to insert a Gentile phrase, he would have no reason for omitting one. Moreover, the tendency of the first Gospel is towards completeness in Old Testament quotations. Luke, in any case, would not omit a Gentile passage. The writer of Mark, however, writing or preparing a Gospel for Gentile readers, and remembering the original passage, may well have added it for completeness. The original form then is probably that of Matthew and Luke. There are several changes of construction in the rendering of the Jeremiah passage. For

an explanation of this we are not to look to any different Septuagint rendering. It is sufficiently explained by the exigencies of the occasion. Jesus so puts it as to make a distinct charge against the defilers of the temple. The freedom of citation on the part of the Evangelists is evidenced by the different renderings of words. Luke, in accordance with his frequent custom, abridges the Isaiah passage.<sup>1</sup> In the parallel account in the fourth Gospel (John ii., 14 *ff.*), Jesus is represented as merely saying, "make not my father's house a house of merchandise," referring perhaps to Zechariah xiv., 21, rather than to the passages alluded to by the Synoptists.

Jesus appears in this incident in his prophetic capacity, a reformer of religious abuses. This act of cleansing the temple is an act in accord with genuine prophetic symbolism. In justification of his action he uses, on his opponents, their own weapon, the Scripture, "It is written." Here again we have similarity of situation and similarity of teaching suggesting from the Old Testament life and thought in which Jesus moved, similarity of language. While the situation

<sup>1</sup> For other examples of composite quotations in the New Testament compare the following:

This composite quotation was a literary custom of the time.

and the teaching are not literally identical, they are sufficiently so in spirit and general purpose to suggest the language employed.

In Isaiah the stress point of the teaching is that the temple is a house of prayer "for all nations." Isaiah 1vi., 6-7: "And the foreigners who have joined themselves to Jehovah, to serve him, and to love the name of Jehovah, that they may be servants to him, whoever keeps the Sabbath not to desecrate it, and those who hold fast to my covenant, —I bring them to my holy mountain, and make them to rejoice in my house of prayer: their whole-offerings and their slain-offerings are well-pleasing upon mine altar; for my house a house of prayer shall be called *for all the nations.*" The prophet here marks an advance in the conception of the temple. It is more than a place of sacrifice; it is a house of prayer. Here also appears the prophetic universalism. It is for all nations.

In Jeremiah vii., 11, the prophet is denouncing the Jewish trust in the temple as superstitious and false in the light of an unethical conception and character which allowed, side by side with temple-worship, participation in moral evil. Standing in the way of the throng going up to the service of the temple, he cries to them that in the view of their shameless oppression, bloodshedding, idolatry, lying, stealing, adultery, false-swearers, and all their other abominations, Jahwe says "you make this house, where my name is called, a den of robbers." The prophet then goes on to predict their rejection by Jahwe and the destruction of the temple which they have profaned and yet in which they trust.

It is to be noticed that in neither quotation is Jesus' application identical. The points of emphasis are dif-

ferent in each case from those of the prophets. In Isaiah, the emphasis is on the temple as a universal house of prayer. In Jeremiah, the stress point is not misuse of the temple, but moral character in general. But, in a general way, Jesus finds the prophetic words applicable to those before him. "As Isaiah said, the temple is for a house of prayer; but to what uses have you perverted it? As said the other great prophet whom you profess to honor, to the Jews of his time, so I say to you; you make it a den of robbers." The circumstances were practically the same as with Jeremiah. A similar superstitious reverence for the temple-building existed, and the same "robbery" existed side by side with it.

Over against the proper use of the temple as given by Isaiah, Jesus sets the perverted use as pictured by Jeremiah. He selects the first of these quotations as the norm of judgment for the temple service as contrasted with the legal conception of oblation, in relation to which the abuses, buying and selling, had grown up. Prayer is the primary idea, and the cultus is nothing in itself. It is of value only as it is an expression or form of prayer. Here Jesus is at one with the prophets, in the ethical as opposed to the ceremonial conception of worship. Like the prophet he sees the ceremonial not only prevailing, but being prostituted to unworthy ends. How natural, then, is the prophetic language in his denunciation.

### *The Unworthy Husbandmen*

Mark xii., 2; Matthew xxi., 33; Luke xx., 9: from Isaiah v., 1, 2.

Hebrew—Isaiah v., 1, 2: "My friend had a vineyard on a fertile hill, and he digged it, and cleared it of stones, and

planted it with choice vines, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also hewed out a wine-vat in it."

Septuagint—"The beloved had a vineyard on a hill, in a fertile place, and I surrounded it with a hedge, and fenced it, and planted a sorek vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and hewed in it a place in front of the wine-press."

Mark xii., 2—"A man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it and digged an under-vat, and built a tower."

Matthew xxi., 33—" (A man, who was an householder) planted a vineyard, and surrounded it with a hedge, and hewed a wine-vat in it, and built a tower."

Luke xx., 9—" (A man) planted a vineyard."

*The Parable*

ISAIAH V., 1-7

1 Let me sing for my wellbeloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My wellbeloved had a vineyard in a very fruitful hill: and he made a trench about it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also hewed out a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should

MARK XII., 1-10

1 And he began to speak unto them in parables. A man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a pit for the winepress, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into 2 another country. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruits 3 of the vineyard. And they took him, and beat him, and 4 sent him away empty. And again he sent unto them another servant; and him they wounded in the head, and handled shamefully. 5 And he sent another; and him they killed: and many others; beating some, and 6 killing some. He had yet

(ISAIAH—*Continued*)

bring forth grapes, brought  
 5 it forth wild grapes? And  
 now go to; I will tell you  
 what I will do to my vine-  
 yard: I will take away the  
 hedge thereof, and it shall  
 be eaten up; I will break  
 down the fence thereof, and  
 6 it shall be trodden down:  
 and I will lay it waste; it  
 shall not be pruned nor  
 hoed; but there shall come  
 up briers and thorns: I will  
 also command the clouds  
 that they rain no rain upon  
 7 it. For the vineyard of the  
 Lord of hosts is the house  
 of Israel, and the men of  
 Judah his pleasant plant:  
 and he looked for judg-  
 ment, but behold oppres-  
 sion; for righteousness, but  
 behold a cry.

MATTHEW XXI., 33-41

33 Hear another parable: There was a man that was a householder, which planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into  
 34 another country. And when the season of the fruits drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, to re-  
 ceive his fruits. And the husbandmen took his ser-

(MARK—*Continued*)

one, a beloved son: he sent  
 him last unto them, saying,  
 They will reverence my son.  
 7 But those husbandmen said  
 among themselves, This is  
 the heir; come, let us kill  
 him, and the inheritance  
 8 shall be ours. And they  
 took him, and killed him,  
 and cast him forth out of  
 9 the vineyard. What there-  
 fore will the lord of the  
 vineyard do? he will come  
 and destroy the husband-  
 men, and will give the  
 vineyard unto others.

LUKE XX., 9-16

9 And he began to speak unto the people this parable: A man planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into another country for a long  
 10 time. And at the season he sent unto the husbandmen a servant, that they should give him of the fruit of the vineyard: but the husbandmen beat him, and sent him away empty.  
 11 And he sent yet another

(MATTHEW—*Continued*)

vants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned  
 36 another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them in like manner.  
 37 But afterward he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.  
 38 But the husbandmen, when they saw the son, said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and take his inheritance.  
 39 And they took him, and cast him forth out of the vineyard, and killed him.  
 40 When therefore the lord of the vineyard shall come, what will he do unto  
 41 those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those miserable men, and will let out the vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

(LUKE—*Continued*)

servant: and him also they beat, and handled him shamefully, and sent him  
 12 away empty. And he sent yet a third: and him also they wounded, and cast  
 13 him forth. And the lord of the vineyard said, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son: it may be they will reverence him.  
 14 But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned one with another, saying, This is the heir: let us kill him, that the inheritance may  
 15 be ours. And they cast him forth out of the vineyard, and killed him. What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do unto them?  
 16 He will come and destroy these husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others.

Jülicher, who holds that Jesus never uttered any allegories, excludes this in anything like its present form, grudgingly admitting that there may have been some simple parable back of it. We are not convinced by Jülicher's discussion that Jesus never used the allegory in his teaching. He is represented as using this means of setting forth truth and we see no inherent improbability in his having done so. In fact, as this was a com-

mon method of his time, there is intrinsic probability that he would, in a reasonable way, use the allegory. In this special section we consider the discourse, in the main outline, as a genuine discourse of Jesus, although it is evident, as we shall see, that the evangelical writers have done some allegorizing on their own account.<sup>1</sup>

It will be seen that the whole section in which this quotation occurs finds its counterpart in Isaiah v., 1-7, the Song of the Lord's Vineyard. Jesus adapts the parable, or more strictly speaking, allegory, of the prophet to his own teaching. Although the only part of the original parable actually quoted consists in the introductory words which Jesus uses, it will be necessary for us to consider the whole section in order to determine Jesus' use of prophecy in this instance. He evidently had the whole of the prophetic passage in mind.

Looked at from one point of view, the parable, or allegory, of Jesus and that of Isaiah are identical; from another, quite different. Isaiah's parable is a "*sinnbild*" of Israel. Opposition has arisen to the prophet and to his teaching. He is speaking to self-confident Israelites who have no thought of any possible abandonment

<sup>1</sup>See Jülicher's *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*; Zweiter Teil; "Die bösen Weingärtner," sec. 37, p. 385 *ff.*—Jülicher's conclusion is: "Es könnte eine Gleichnisrede Jesu von bösen Weinbergsächtern, die vielleicht Mc. 1:9 noch am meisten durchklingt und deren Idee Mt. 4:3 treffend wiedergiebt, existiert haben; ein Versuch sie zu rekonstruiren, ist aussichtslos, da unsre einzige Quelle Mc. 12 bis auf den letzten Rest als Produkt urchristlicher Theologie, um so weniger als authentisches Protokoll einer kampfrede Jesu verständlich ist. 'Dieser ist der Erbe' haben die Hierarchen von Jesus nie gesagt oder gedacht; ihr Bild wird auch schon mit Einmischung christlicher Urteile gezeichnet. Das Urchristentum, nicht Jesus selber scheint Mc. 12:1-11 das Wort zu führen" (p. 406).

of Judah by God. The stress point of the prophet's preaching is the danger of this very thing. His teaching is heterodoxy of the most flagrant type. Isaiah, in the delivery of this parable, makes a direct attack on his opponents. He depicts with graphic beauty a vineyard on a fertile hill. Its owner and planter has cleared it, planted it with choice vines, and given it every opportunity for development. He comes, at the season, to look for grapes, but finds only sour berries. The prophet turns sharply to his opposers and asks for their own judgment as to what the lord of the vineyard shall do. Receiving no answer, he himself announces the abandonment of so worthless a vineyard and then directly applies the parable: "For the vineyard of Jahwe of Hosts is Israel, and the men of Judah his delightful plant; he looked for justice and behold, oppression; for righteousness, but behold, a cry!" The clear teaching of the prophet is, that although God had long cared for and fostered Israel he would yet abandon it to its destruction, owing to its moral worthlessness.

Nearly eight centuries later, Jesus Christ, the great successor of the prophet, finds himself in a like situation, with a similar group of hearers, in need of the same lesson. Jesus has just been engaged in a controversy with his opponents. Mark undoubtedly has the right setting. Mark is supported by Luke, except that Mark xi., 20-26, which is only incidental, is not given by Luke. Matthew's setting is plainly subjective. Just before this, Jesus has performed the symbolic act of cleansing the temple. He is walking in the temple (Mark xi., 27) shortly after, when the chief-priests, scribes, and elders intercept him and demand his authority for doing "these things." He first discomfits them by his question as to the status of John the Bap-

tist, and then suddenly turns from defence to attack by means of his powerful weapon, the illustration. Similarity of situation and teaching suggest this older allegory of Isaiah. His words are directed to the leaders of Israel who stand before him. Luke's representation that it was addressed to the people does not, as Holtzmann seems to think, betray any misunderstanding on Luke's part that in its application it was directed to the leaders. Jesus probably does not confine the idea to a receiving of the Gospel by the Gentiles specifically, although this might be included. He seems to indicate more generally the passage of the benefits of God's grace from unworthy to worthy recipients. Matthew (xxi., 43), however, seems to limit it to the Gentiles. Jesus tells these leaders that the day of their authority and leadership is at an end. The vineyard is their property no longer. This is in accord with Jesus' teaching regarding the Kingdom of God as we find it elsewhere. Not the many called, but the few chosen: Not the first invited are to go in unto the feast. The Kingdom of God is to go beyond Israel. (Luke xiii., 28-30, xiv., 16 *ff.*; Matthew xxii., 14.)

The servants refer to his predecessors, the prophets. (Compare 2 Chron. xxxvi., 15, 16; Nehemiah ix., 26; Jeremiah xxv., 2-7.) He has just been questioning them with regard to one of these ill-used predecessors, John the Baptist. The successive sending indicates the largeness of the opportunity given them. In the development of the allegory the different Evangelists evince a difference of understanding with regard to the application to the prophets. Matthew (xxi., 34-36), as elsewhere (xxii., 3, 4), in reference to the earlier and later prophets, makes two sets of servants. (So Holtzmann.) The larger number in the second case may

indicate the added force of the later message. In Mark and Luke the simpler and probably more original form is preserved, and they represent merely the successive prophets as they came on the scene one after the other. Luke is at pains to make a gradation with regard to the treatment of the prophets, and reserves the killing for the son. Here the writers have undoubtedly allegorized to some extent on their own account.

With regard to the application as a lesson, however, the accounts agree. That Jesus refers to the prophets, and, by the son, to himself, seems clear, and not improbable. There is indisputable evidence that here, near the close of his ministry, at his last sojourn in Jerusalem, all of which he realizes, Jesus comes out as the true Messiah. He here puts into words what his preceding action, in cleansing the temple, had symbolized. He thus answers their questions as to his authority. His is the authority of the Son of God.

While Jesus evidently depends on Isaiah for the form of his teaching, he is independent in his development of it. He does not directly represent God as the owner of the vineyard. He rather puts his illustration in every-day speech. He has a preference for putting such parables into the form of a single event in definite circumstances taken from scenes at hand. His parables are such as could happen in actual life and are concretely put. (Mark iv., 3 *ff.*; Matthew vii., 24, xviii., 23, xxi., 28; Luke xv., 11, etc.)

Jesus also conceives differently of the method of the judgment. In Isaiah (v., 6), God abandons the vineyard. Here, in order to make it applicable to the leaders, Jesus represents God as giving it over to others. He shows, further, that with regard to the fruits, the husbandmen had cultivated the vineyard to

their own profit. While Jesus carries out his lesson in a different way, his parable still contains points of contact with that of the prophet. Isaiah conceived of Israel's discomfiture by means of the nations, and Jesus seems to have anticipated the destruction of Jerusalem as a similar means of judgment. The prophet (v., 3, 4) appeals to his hearers for their own judgment on themselves. Jesus likewise uses the *argumentum ad hominem*. The main teaching is the same: that God's favor will pass from unworthy to worthy recipients. It is not likely that our Lord consciously sought any correspondence here. It is entirely natural. The likeness between the illustration of Jesus and that of Isaiah is mainly in the identity of the truth taught. For the teaching of this truth, Isaiah's picture suggests that which Jesus sets forth.

Having thus considered the use of Old Testament prophecy which forms the setting of the actual quotation, let us now discuss the words quoted. A comparison of the quotations in the Gospels evidences either expansion by Matthew and abbreviation by Luke; or abbreviation by Mark and Luke; or expansion by Mark and Matthew. In the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest, we find in Luke—"a certain man planted . . . and surrounded it . . . and committed it, etc." Very likely this may have been in an original manuscript. But a shortened form in Luke is not unusual. Writing for Gentile readers, he would not have the same concern to preserve an Old Testament quotation that Matthew would have. As to the longer form in Matthew, as we proceed in our investigation we shall see a tendency on the part of the writer of the first Gospel to cherish Old Testament citations, frequently amplifying, sometimes inserting them or

adding them as his own explanatory comments.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, an opposite tendency to abbreviate is characteristic of the third Gospel, where the entire matter is not necessary to the writer's purpose.

Mark's is probably the more original form. The whole section comprising the parable (Mark xii., 1-11) contains all the words, except four which are unimportant, that are common to the parallels in Matthew and Luke.<sup>2</sup>

A comparison of the texts indicates the Septuagint as the source of the citation. The terms are mainly those of the Septuagint. The person is changed from the first to the third, this being necessary in adaptation. The quotation is nearly verbal from Isaiah. Jesus may well have used this verbal citation in his introduction because of his hearers' familiarity with the allegory which he adopts and adapts to his teaching. The designation of Israel as a vine or vineyard was a common one. (Compare Jer. ii., 21; Ezek. xv., 1-6, xix., 10-14; Hos. x., 1; Ps. lxxx., 8-11; Joel i., 7.) Moreover, this Song of the Vineyard of Israel was evidently well known. It is used in the Apocalypse of Is., chapters xxiv. to xxvii., where the basis is partly this fifth chapter of Isaiah. (Compare also Psalm lxxx., an early Psalm.)

<sup>1</sup> Note the following instances where Matthew is supported by neither Mark nor Luke: ix., 36; xiii., 35; xxi., 4, 5; xiii., 14, 15 (his own comments); xxii., 40; vii., 12 (to conserve the Jewish law); ii., 15; ii., 17, 18; ii., 23; iv., 14-16 (where the Septuagint is apparently altered to meet the purpose); xii., 17-21; xxi., 4, 5; xxvii., 9, 10; xxi., 10, 11 (where the concern is either to honor the O. T., or to add to the proof of Jesus' Messiahship by resting it on the O. T.).

<sup>2</sup> Article "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—Abbott.

We see, then, that in the entire illustration, and in the introduction where the quotation is verbal, Jesus' use of prophecy here rests on—1. Similarity of occasion. 2. Similarity and almost identity with the truth he has to teach. 3. The familiarity of his hearers with the passage in Isaiah. His treatment is free. He amplifies and develops his illustration quite differently from Isaiah, while preserving many features. The main likeness is that of spirit and purpose. His introduction by the use of the scriptural language was to draw the attention of his hearers. It was a fine sermonic use of Scripture. Jesus used it just as any preacher or prophet of to-day might do under similar circumstances and with a like purpose.

### *The Corner-Stone*

Mark xii., 10, 11; Matthew xxi., 42; Luke xx., 17: from Psalm cxviii., 22, 23. (Compare also Isaiah xxviii., 14-18.)

Hebrew—Psalm cxviii., 22, 23: “A stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. From Jahwe was this: it is wonderful in our eyes.”

Septuagint—Psalm cxvii., 22, 23: “A stone which the builders rejected; the same has become the head of the corner. From the Lord was this, and it is wonderful in our eyes.”

Mark xii., 10, 11 }—Identical with the Septuagint.  
Matthew xxi., 42 }

### *The Setting*

Mark xii., 10-12—“Have ye not read even this scripture; The stone which the builders rejected, The same was made the head of the corner: This was from the Lord, And it is marvellous in our eyes?

And they sought to lay hold on him; and they feared the multitude; for they perceived that he spake the parable against them: and they left him, and went away.”

Matthew xxi., 42-46—"Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures,

The stone which the builders rejected,  
The same was made the head of the corner :  
This was from the Lord,  
And it is marvellous in our eyes?

Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. (And he that falleth on this stone shall be broken to pieces : but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust.) And when the chief priests and the Pharisees heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them. And when they sought to lay hold on him, they feared the multitudes, because they took him for a prophet.

Luke xx., 17-19—"But he looked upon them, and said, What then is this that is written,

The stone which the builders rejected,  
The same was made the head of the corner?

Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces ; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust.

"And the scribes and the chief priests sought to lay hands on him in that very hour ; and they feared the people : for they perceived that he spake this parable against them."

The passage is quoted from the Septuagint and is identical with it. We have in this case a similar instance to passages previously discussed, *i. e.*, a shortened form in Luke, who omits the second half of the passage. The setting is the same in all three Gospels, following the Parable of the Vineyard. Mark introduces the quotation with the words, "Have ye not read even this Scripture," and then immediately adds, after the quotation "and they sought to lay hold on him, etc." Matthew's introduction is similar to that of Mark, "Did ye never read in the Scriptures." After the quotation, however, he puts in Jesus' mouth a definite explanation and application of the parable. "The Kingdom

of God shall be taken away from you and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Luke introduces by the familiar "it is written" formula. We have here evidence of expansion in the first Gospel —verse 43 looks like an explanatory insertion. The use of the term "Kingdom of God" instead of Matthew's almost universal "Kingdom of Heaven" is a further indication of lateness. Luke does not have it, and we cannot understand why he would leave out a "Gentile" passage. Verse 18 in Luke gives the passage an added Messianic coloring. The parallel to this (Matthew xxi., 44) is bracketed by W. & H. and Tischendorf omits it. It is lacking in the Western manuscripts. The same passage in Luke is textually supported, however. We shall discuss the Luke passage in another connection.

With regard to the quotation from Psalm cxviii, Jesus applies it to himself by way of analogy. If the chief-priests rejected and removed him, as they were about to do, he would not really be set aside, but by God's appointment would become the foundation stone of the new building of the Kingdom of God. The Psalm passage was a Messianic one and was typically considered so by the Rabbis themselves.

We have here the use by Jesus of another figure familiar to his hearers. The term used was a well-known one, occurring, for example, in Isaiah xxviii., 14-18. In the Psalm, which is post-exilic, belonging to the second temple, the reference is to Israel, rejected by the nations, but chosen by God to be his people, the conveyers of his message to the world, the corner-stone of his kingdom. Israel is in sore distress, and would seem to be on the verge of destruction, but the Psalmist prophetically sees the rejected corner-stone given its

rightful place by God. Some critics refer the Psalm to the Maccabean period, representing the Maccabean family, once without esteem but raised to power by the hand of God. In either case the interpretation would be practically the same.

The wider teaching is—the judgment and selection of God as a reversal of that of man. Jesus applies this to Israel's hierarchy. It is a more explicit statement of his teaching in the preceding parable, that the vineyard was to be taken from them and given to other husbandmen. Whether the addition in Matthew (verse 43), giving the saying the definite application to the rejection of Israel and the substitution of the Gentiles, be genuine or not, this would be included. Jesus had ere this seen beyond Judaism and comprehended the necessary universalism of the new kingdom, and had found already, in publicans and sinners, its most worthy recipients. Jesus here gives utterance to his conviction that with himself as the corner-stone is to arise the new temple of the Kingdom of God. In the parable he has declared the fate of the Jewish hierarchy. Here he announces his own destiny. Then (Luke xx., 18) he declares the fate of those who oppose him.

Considering the parable previously discussed and its explicit application here, the order of thought is as follows :

1. Israel a vineyard of God.
2. It has been given in charge to the husbandmen who stand before him.
3. They have proved unworthy husbandmen. As their predecessors rejected his predecessors, the prophets, so they have rejected the Son.
4. Hence the vineyard shall be taken from them.

5. A new order of things is to take place with Jesus himself as the foundation.

6. Judgment on those who do not enter the new Kingdom.

The prophecy is used by way of analogy. Its use is didactic and homiletic throughout. While it might seem as though for such an explicit announcement open statement would be preferable to the use of parable, yet, in this instance, the use of the Old Testament figure really makes it more explicit. The phrases used were a part of the dialect of those to whom Jesus was speaking. Every one of those to whom he spoke would know just what was meant by every term. Jesus thus uses their own weapons on them. In no way does he cite these words to indicate either prediction or fulfilment. The historical reference in the Psalm is to the people of Israel. It is the *principle* only that applies to Jesus. He states here, as elsewhere, the reversal by God of human judgment. The use of this passage by Jesus by no means indicates that he used it as the Rabbis would, as the statement of any prediction regarding himself. In his use here, as elsewhere, he is concerned with the truth or principle which the passage sets forth in such striking rhetorical form. The same Old Testament term, descriptive of Jesus, is used in Acts iv., 11, Ephesians ii., 20, and 1 Peter ii., 7-9.

### *The Challenge to Scribal Interpretation*

Mark xii., 36, 37; Matthew xxii., 43-45; Luke xx., 42, 43: from Psalm cx., 1. [Compare Psalm viii., 7 (6).]

Hebrew—Psalm cx., 1: “Saith Jahwe to my lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I place thine enemies as a footstool for thy feet.”

Septuagint—Psalm cix., 1: “Said the Lord to my lord, Sit

thou on my right hand until I place thine enemies as a footstool for thy feet."

Mark xii., 36—

" Said the Lord unto my Lord,  
Sit thou on my right hand,  
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet."

Matthew xxii., 44—

" The Lord said unto my Lord,  
Sit thou on my right hand,  
Till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet."

Luke xx., 42, 43—

" The Lord said unto my Lord,  
Sit thou on my right hand,  
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet."

The substantial identity of the Septuagint and the three Gospels is here noticeable. The only difference in the texts we have adopted is a slight one in Matthew. Several manuscripts, followed by W. & H. and Tischendorf, have the same change in Mark's text. The Sinaitic Palimpsest also has it. The change in Matthew may be that of a free rendering, although the identity of the rest of the quotation makes this doubtful. The writer's rendering may have been influenced by the recollection of Psalm viii., 7, where the same word is used. The latter seems to be the probable explanation.

All three Gospels give the incident a similar general setting. There are, however, incidental differences as to surrounding and immediate occasion. Matthew narrates, just preceding, Jesus' conversation with the Pharisees who attempted to " ensnare him in his talk." First Jesus had put the Sadducees to silence and then had given a striking answer to one of the Pharisees, a lawyer, who had asked him concerning the great commandment in the law. Following this the first Gospel

continues: "Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question, saying, What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in the spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said, etc." "If David then calleth him Lord, how is he his son? And no one was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions." Jesus then (ch. xxiii.) continues and warns the multitudes and his disciples against the formalism of the Scribes and Pharisees, and concludes by pronouncing his "woes" on them.

Mark has a similar order, but with a somewhat different rendering of the discourse concerning the question of the first commandment, and then continues (verse 35): "And Jesus answered and said, as he taught in the temple, How say the Scribes that the Christ is the son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit, The Lord said, etc." "David himself calleth him Lord: and whence is he his son?" Then, like Matthew, he gives in shorter form the warnings against the "Scribes," omitting mention of the Pharisees.

Luke represents Jesus as refuting the Sadducees, after which "certain of the Scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said. For they durst not any more ask him any question. And he said unto them, How say they that the Christ is David's son? For David himself saith in the Book of Psalms, The Lord said, etc." "David therefore calleth him Lord, and how is he his son?" Then follows the warning against the Scribes, as Mark gives it.

The main differences are Luke's substitution of "in

the Book of Psalms" for Matthew's "in the spirit" and Mark's "in the Holy Spirit." The writers also vary as to those to whom Jesus' question is addressed. Matthew's phrase "in the spirit" is the only case of its use in the Gospels. Luke's "in the Book of Psalms" is his own insertion in the interest of accuracy. Mark's is probably the original form. Matthew represents Jesus as asking the "Pharisees" a direct question concerning the Christ and his relation to David. Mark presents Jesus as teaching in the temple and referring to the "Scribes" as to their Messianic teaching concerning Christ as David's son. Luke represents him as putting the question to the "Scribes" rhetorically and then giving his objection. This indicates a difference as to the idea of Jesus' immediate aim. Matthew is evidently concerned to represent Jesus as entangling the "Pharisees." While this may be a part of Jesus' plan, that is, to silence them, it is not his chief purpose, although we do find him silencing them by similar means and with fine dialectical skill, as in the case where he puts the question concerning the status of John the Baptist. But this question was addressed, as Mark and Luke represent, to the Scribes. His main purpose is to present a great spiritual truth and to set it over against the literalness of current rabbinic scribal teaching. He falls back on Scripture itself, as he so often does in similar arguments with regard to views and customs of his time which he repudiates.

We have here a most significant teaching of Jesus with regard to the right and wrong use of prophecy. It is a striking criticism of the rabbinic teaching concerning the Messiah. In their attention to the literal and detailed consideration of Messianic traits they overlooked that which was of real and vital significance, the

moral and spiritual character of the Christ. The Rabbis, like some later writers of the Christian Church, were greatly concerned as to the Davidic descent of the Messiah. Jesus refers here to a Psalm which was currently ascribed to David, and considered as Messianic. In Psalm cx., in the passage under consideration, according to the general view David was represented as referring to the Messiah as his Lord. As a matter of fact, later criticism has arrived at the conclusion that the Psalm is not Davidic, but that it belongs to a late, probably the Maccabean, period.

It may not be out of place to mention in this connection, that to some writers this has seemed to bring up a great difficulty in regard to the matter of Christ's errancy in attributing the words to David. Some expositors have even gone so far as to cite Jesus' words as a proof of the Davidic authorship of the Psalm, and as overthrowing all evidence to the contrary. But no real difficulty exists. To suppose that Jesus could be cognizant of the results of later exegesis is as grotesque and unnatural as to suppose that he would claim for himself knowledge of all modern scientific invention and discovery. While the latter fact has been claimed for him by some modern writers who, like the older Rabbis, are concerned with the unessential to the beclouding of those things which are vital, such attempts have never won assent to any appreciable extent. We have abundant evidence that Jesus accepted the current views of his time on such questions. He undoubtedly accepted the Mosaic authority of the Pentateuch and the Davidic origin of the Psalms.

Still another question which has troubled some commentators is that concerning the bearing of this passage on the actual matter of Christ's descent from David;

some affirming that he here explicitly denies his own Davidic descent. But Jesus no more answers this question than the other. It is plainly evident that the Evangelists and other early writers did not consider it a denial. Jesus is not concerned about this question, however, and he neither affirms nor denies his Davidic descent. As we shall see, he teaches that it is not a matter of any significance.

This discourse of Jesus is not merely a sophistical endeavor to entangle the Scribes by citing scriptural contradictions. The Scribes cannot answer his question because of their narrow, literal, and formal conception of Messiah which they have compressed into the phrase "Son of David." Jesus himself can answer the question, from his point of view. Spiritually he is David's lord, by reason of his relation to the Father. He really waives the question of natural descent. His purpose is to point out the difference between a conception of Messiah as merely "of the seed of David," *i. e.*, "according to the flesh," and that larger conception of Messiah as "Lord," *i. e.*, "according to the spirit." (Romans i., 3, 4.) Here is a truth entirely independent of that criticism and exegesis of the Psalm which concerned the Rabbis, and which, unfortunately, has concerned many Christian writers of later times. As Toy says, "by one stroke he overthrew the current theory of the Messiah and substituted a purer conception." It is the difference between a political greatness dependent on Davidic descent, and a spiritual exaltation resting upon relationship with God. While the motive of Jesus was to indicate the scribal inability to interpret the spiritual truths of the Old Testament, it was mainly concerned with the teaching itself. The sonship from God was the important trait of the Messiah,

not correspondence with a literalized prophetic announcement. While the letter killeth, the spirit giveth life.

In reality, the term "Son of God" had no definite invariable sense as applied to Messiah by the Scribes. This was a secondary matter to the Jews and hence the term was vague. As Wendt says, "According to the Jewish idea the Messianic King was also Son of God; according to Jesus' idea, the Son of God, as such, was the Messianic King." The Scribes considered descent from David as the clearly defined and significant matter, while his divine relation was almost, if not entirely, an open question. Christ says—"The spiritual character of Messiah is the important thing; blood relationship with David an entirely secondary matter," if indeed the latter had any significance at all. As a matter of fact, whatever reliance we may be inclined to place on the testimony of the actual Davidic descent of Jesus as represented by the Gospel writers, and while we cannot say that Jesus denies it here, it is certain that he never used it as proof of his Messiahship. He at least passed it by.

Right at this point is suggested that difference of use of the Old Testament by Jesus from the use made of Scripture by the apostolic writers, which difference we shall discuss later. For Jesus does more here than point out the error of the Scribes in giving consideration to the "letter," to the subordination of the "spirit" in this particular question. He repudiates as well the means by which they did so. In condemning the act, he at the same time, *a minori ad majus*, condemns the principle of interpretation which led to the error. Jesus strikes the death-blow to the whole method of using the Scriptures which the Rabbis and Scribes

followed, and which influenced the Christian writers of the apostolic circle by the exegesis and limitations of a scribal age; a method which is not altogether without examples in our own time. It was by a study of just such questions as that of Davidic relationship that the evangelical writers were misled. Literal conformity to Scripture was, at least in part, their rule. Spiritual affinity was altogether the rule of Christ, as evidenced by his rebuke here and by his own use of Scripture. For him, conformity to Scripture meant nothing, except as it concerned the ethical and spiritual.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare John vii., 26-29, where Jesus, in uttering a similar rebuke to that here discussed, indicates the unimportance of his earthly origin and relation as compared with his relation to God.

*Note on the Question of Davidic Descent.*—Inasmuch as this passage has been the subject of so much discussion as to Jesus' relationship to David, it may be in order for us to suggest more fully what Jesus' attitude was in this case. It is argued by some writers that his object was not only to overthrow the idea of the temporal and political kingship of the Messiah, but also to dispose of the fallacy of his Davidic descent as well. On this Colani says: "A la fin de ses vives discussions avec les scribes et les pharisiens, dans les tout derniers jours de sa vie, il leur pose cette question: 'Comment pouvez-vous dire que le Messie doit être Fils de David, tandis que David lui-même l'appelle son Seigneur dans le Psaume CX.? Si David l'appelle son Seigneur, le Messie *ne peut donc être* Fils de David.' Ce raisonnement de Jésus n'est pas un argument fri-vole et des plus subtils, destiné à jeter les scribes à leur tour dans l'embarras, comme ils ont essayé de l'y jeter à plusieurs reprises. Ce n'est pas un tour de sophiste. S'appuyant sur un passage d'un psaume, qu'il interprète comme les scribes eux-mêmes, il déclare que le Messie doit être infiniment plus grand qu'un David, qu'un roi temporel, et que, par conséquent, on ne doit pas comparer le Messie à ce roi, ni l'appeler Fils de David ou, comme nous dirions, un second David." (*Jésus-Christ et*

*The Divided Households*

Mark xiii., 12; Matthew x., 35, 36; Luke xii., 52, 53; Matthew x., 21: from Micah vii., 6.

Hebrew—Micah vii., 6: “For son despiseth father, daughter is risen up against her mother, daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and the enemies of a man are the men of his house.”

Septuagint—“For son dishonoreth father, daughter is risen up against her mother, young bride against her mother-in-law; all the enemies of a man those in his own house.”

Mark xiii., 12—“And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and father, child, and children shall rise up against parents, and put them to death.”

Matthew x., 21—Identical with Mark.

Matthew x., 35, 36—“For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and daughter against her mother, and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: and a man’s foes are they of his own household.”

Luke xii., 52, 53—“For there shall be from henceforth five in one house, divided, three against two, and two against three. They shall be divided, father against son, and son against father; mother against daughter, and daughter against her mother; mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.”

It is not necessary to suppose that Jesus, in these passages, consciously quotes the words of Micah. His *les Croyances Messianiques de Son Temps*, Part II., chapter ii., page 105 of the second edition.)

Strauss takes a similar view. Renan takes a different view from that of Colani. He holds that Jesus knew that he was not the Son of David, but that he accepted the title. He says: “Le titre de ‘fils de David’ fut le premier qu’il accepta, probablement sans tremper dans les fraudes innocentes par lesquelles on chercha à le lui assurer. . . . La croyance universelle était que le Messie serait fils de David, et naîtrait comme lui à Bethlehem. Le sentiment premier de Jésus n’était pas précisément cela. . . . Il se croyait fils de Dieu, et non pas fils de David. . . . Mais l’opinion ici lui fit une sorte de violence.

familiarity with Old Testament thought and language causes the expressions to spring naturally and spontaneously to his lips. The passages Mark xiii., 12,

La conséquence immédiate de cette proposition : 'Jésus est le Messie,' était cette autre proposition : 'Jésus est fils de David.' Il se laissa donner un titre sans lequel il ne pouvait espérer aucun succès." (*Vie de Jésus*, chapter xv., pages 245 ff.)

Among later writers who hold that Jesus denied Davidic descent is J. Estlin Carpenter (*The First Three Gospels*, chapter vii., section 1, page 222).

Stanton remarks: "This is to assume that Jesus set himself not only against one of the most universally accepted points of the Messianic doctrine of his day, but one which could not but be deduced from the Old Testament itself, if Messianic prophecy were recognized there at all, and which continued to be fully believed among his disciples." (*The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, chapter iii., page 262.) Stanton's first argument is not a strong one, for Jesus did set himself against universally accepted points in the Messianic doctrine of his day. Renan's explanation is one altogether unworthy of Christ, as we remarked in another connection. Colani and Carpenter go too far in assuming a positive denial. While Jesus would not deny that Messianic descent from David could be deduced from the Old Testament, inasmuch as it was so deduced by the Scribes, he would be able to see a difference between a deduction which involved the idea of blood-relationship, by a literal interpretation, and a more general deduction which would make the reference to relationship with David a national one, meaning that Messiah is a son of David as a representative of the Jewish race. While it is our opinion that Jesus did not trace any direct relationship with David, as a matter of fact, we think that those who hold that Jesus denies such relationship here are equally in error with those who would hold that because of the Old Testament descriptions of Christ as being in such relationship, he must have had a blood connection with David. The truth is that Jesus neither affirms nor denies such connection, either here or anywhere else. The very point of this discourse shows that for him this question had no importance at all.

and Matthew x., 21, which are identical, Mark probably being the source, are, in any case, mere reminiscences of the prophet's language. Matthew x., 35, 36, and Luke xii., 52, 53, although differing in form, are parallels and are similarly introduced by Matthew x., 34, and Luke xii., 51. The source in quoting is evidently the Septuagint, which is freely rendered in each case. (See *The International Critical Commentary*—“Luke”—Plummer, page 335.) In treating of Christ's use of prophecy here, it is not necessary that we should enter into the criticism and exegesis of these passages, for there is nothing in the way of direct application of the prophetic words.

The writer of Micah vii., 6, is characterizing Jerusalem as the centre of the iniquities of the nation. He is describing those evils which are rapidly dissolving the nation. Among these are commercial greed and selfishness. “They all lie in wait for blood; they hunt every man his brother with a net.” This has even gone to the extent of breaking up families, and in their selfish every-man-for-himself attitude, sons, fathers, daughters, mothers, and blood relations generally are in strife and competition with one another.

Jesus is picturing the evils which he sees to be the inevitable result of the preaching of his Gospel. Warfare and division will result, the disciples will be delivered up to councils and beaten in synagogues and hated of all men. Jesus merely borrows this striking Old Testament language in describing the extent to which these divisions will extend. It is a free use and adaptation of prophetic language.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On a use of this quotation in the Mishna see Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, “The Jewish Doctrine of the Messiah,” page 153.

## 2.—QUOTATIONS SUPPORTED BY MARK AND MATTHEW

*Jesus' Rebuke of Unreality in Worship*

Mark vii., 6, 7; Matthew xv., 8, 9: from Isaiah xxix., 13.

Hebrew—Isaiah xxix., 13: “And saith Adonai—Because this people draws near with its mouth, and with its lips honors me, and its heart keeps far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men which they have learned.”

Septuagint—“And the Lord said—This people draws near to me with its mouth and with their lips they honor me, but their heart they keep far from me; indeed, vainly they worship me, teaching ordinances of men and teachings.”

Mark vii., 6, 7—“This people with the lips honor me, but their heart is far from me; but vainly they worship me, teaching as teachings ordinances of men.”

Matthew xv., 8, 9—Identical with Mark.

Mark and Matthew agree in their rendering, with the exception of the change of order in the first three words, which is perhaps a correction by the writer of the first Gospel. Probably Matthew is following Mark here. The Septuagint is essentially followed, except that the clause “draws near to me with its mouth” is omitted, and the last part transposed, with changes of wording. Toy suggests that the changes of order may be on account of the use of an Aramaic version, perhaps one which followed the Septuagint closely. Mark’s verses 8 and 9 are probably an expansion. Matthew 3<sup>B</sup> is all that corresponds to them. The change of the latter clause of the Septuagint, “teaching ordinances of men and teachings,” into, “teaching as teachings ordinances of men,” is an improvement so far as it brings out the contrast between a man-taught and a God-taught teaching. We have numerous examples of such changes by New Testament writers, made in order to add to the argument. (See Johnson, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*, chapter

iv.) Noticeably enough, it is this latter clause, mis-translated by the Septuagint, and then misquoted from the Septuagint by the Evangelists, which constitutes the real point of the saying as applied by Jesus.

The order of the setting varies in the two Gospels. Both introduce the quotation in substantially the same way. Mark: "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, hypocrites, as it is written." Matthew: "Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying." Here again we have another case of an appeal by Jesus to the words of the prophet as applicable to his opponents, and again in answer to a criticism on their part. Hypocritical worship, unethical worship, without connection with life and faith, was a frequent subject of prophetic rebuke. Isaiah is replete with such denunciations. (*See* chapter i. *See also* Micah vi., 6-8, iii., 11; and Ezekiel xxxiii., 31.) This is the ethical conception of prophecy as opposed to the purely formal and ritualistic. The prophet attributes the demoralization of those to whom he speaks to the lifelessness of their religion. Then he goes on to announce the punishment of God. They do not see and hear him but he is going to make himself heard and felt with thundering voice and chastening hand. The prophet is speaking to a people in whom political security and religious formalism have stifled reason and conscience, and have emptied worship of all ethical content.

Jesus sees in the Jewish leaders and their followers before him a like condition. Not political security, but a release from political cares is here combined with religious formalism. They have just criticised the disciples for "transgressing the tradition of the elders" by eating with "unwashen hands." Jesus replies by telling them that they place their traditions above the

“commandment of God” and set aside the latter in observing the former. He cites an illustration of this, and, while he speaks, these appropriate words of Isaiah come to his lips. His explicit “well did Isaiah prophesy of you” means “well did Isaiah describe you.” His direct way of putting it is for emphasis. There can be no need of seeking anything like “typical prediction” in the Isaiah passage. Jesus’ use is sufficiently forceful and far more natural without burdening it with that literalness of citation which, as we have seen (*see* discussion of Mark xii., 36), Jesus rebukes. It is here as if Jesus said: “Listen to this teaching of the prophet. You think he speaks to those back there in his time. But you do not understand prophecy. It is principle, universal truth, and it applies to you.”

While the whole quotation is applicable to those he addresses, the final clause states the point of the rebuke. They ignore the divine command and substitute their own human tradition. Their method of interpretation was one that lost sight of the real meaning in their concern for the letter only. In making this interpretation authoritative they substitute human for divine authority. The difference between Jesus and the Pharisees and Rabbis is thus clearly indicated. He goes back of their formal and external conception of God’s word to the living word itself. For example, his hearers are thoroughly familiar with the prophecy he quotes, but do not see its true meaning. If they did, they would see its moral application to themselves. Jesus, seeing the true meaning, perceives its universal application as a great principle. In Jesus’ use of prophecy we see here again likeness of situation, hearers and teaching suggesting the prophetic language. It was a fine sermonic use of Scripture.

*The Sheep Shall be Scattered*

Mark xiv., 27; Matthew xxvi., 31: from Zechariah xiii., 7.  
(Compare Ezekiel xxxiv., 2.)

Hebrew—Zechariah xiii., 7: “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jahwe of Hosts: smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand against the little ones.”

Vatican Septuagint—“Smite ye the shepherds and draw out the sheep.”

Alexandrian Septuagint—“Smite thou the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered.”

Mark xiv., 27—“I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered.”

Matthew xxvi., 31—“I will smite the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered.”

The Vatican Septuagint, probably owing to a misreading of the Hebrew text, gives the idea that the sheep are to be rescued. The Gospels appear to be following the Septuagint, but very likely an Aramaic rendering. Mark is nearest to the Hebrew. It is probable that the Alexandrian Septuagint has been changed to agree with Matthew. Both Evangelists depart from Hebrew and Septuagint in rendering the verb in the first person. It is quite likely that this is due to Jesus' own rendering, citing the expression freely.

Jesus' use of prophecy in this instance is that of mere accommodation of Old Testament language. The prophet is prophesying the exile of the people, the purpose of which is to refine them and bring them back to God. This original prophecy is for the immediate, not a remote, future. The sword is represented as the instrument by which God is to bring this about. The use of the imperative is for emphasis (compare Isaiah vi., 9, 10). The sword is commanded to smite “the man that is my fellow”—“the shepherd,”—that is, the

king or ruler of Israel, who shares with God the government of his people. "Smite the shepherd that the sheep may be scattered." That is: "Smite the ruler that the people may be scattered in exile." This is for their purification, after the accomplishment of which they will return to Jahwe and acknowledge him as God. We have a similar figure in xi., 7, 8, and 15-17, where the shepherds are referred to as "wearying" God. The shepherd is a "foolish" or "worthless" shepherd that cares not for the flock. Undoubtedly chapter xiii., 7-9, and chapter xi. belong in connection. (So George Adam Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets.*)

Jesus merely borrows the language which was used by the prophet, and uses the figure without any possible predictive application. The parallelism between the two situations is simply that in both cases the scattering of the followers is the result of the smiting of the leader. Otherwise the situations are totally different. The shepherd in Zechariah is smitten and the flock scattered as the result and punishment of their own sin. This shepherd is a "foolish shepherd" who does not visit those that are cut off, nor seek those that are scattered, nor heal that which is broken, nor feed that which standeth; but who eats the flesh of the fat and tears their hoofs in pieces; a "worthless" shepherd that leaves the flock (Zech. xi., 15-17); one of those shepherds of whom God is weary (Zech. xi., 7, 8).

All this precludes anything like an application of the prophetic words directly or typically to Christ. And yet, disregarding all this, Professor Briggs does so regard it. (See *The Messiah of the Gospels*, page 125 ff.) He makes the prophecy Messianic. He takes the phrase "the man that is my fellow" to prove that the

servant here is not the evil servant such as Zech. xi., 7, 8, and 15-17, depicts, but a faithful shepherd who "falls because of the sins of the people whose shepherd he is," one who "gives his life for his flock." In this way he finds a way to apply the prophecy to the rejected shepherd, Jesus Christ. (*Messianic Prophecy*, page 465.)

As we have seen, the natural interpretation of our passage in Zechariah is that it refers to the faithless shepherd of the context. This is entirely in accord with the prophetic method, which never spares the leaders, but inclines to make them largely responsible for the sins of the people. Any one who reads chapters xi., 1-17, and xiii., 7-9, would conclude naturally that the prophet all along is referring to the wicked shepherd. Professor Briggs seems to rest his interpretation on the phrase "the man that is my fellow." But this is evidently ironical. It designates the office rather than the moral character of the occupant. It is a similar use to that in Psalm xli., 9: "He that eateth with me." The fact that he refers to this shepherd in this verse as "my shepherd," and again in chapter xi., 17, to "my worthless shepherd," indicates the ironical use here.<sup>1</sup>

The translator of the Vatican MSS. evidently took "the shepherd" in this sense. Strangely enough, as it seems to us, while Professor Smith connects xi., 1-17, and xiii., 7-9, he refers the shepherd in the former to the worthless, but the shepherd in xiii., 7-9, to the good shepherd.

But even if we should grant all this, any such

<sup>1</sup>The reading in xi., 17, is doubtless as emended by G. A. Smith and Wellhausen. See G. A. Smith, *Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii.; and Wellhausen's *Die kleinen Propheten*.

application as Professor Briggs makes of the passage to Jesus is impossible. Whatever we may say as to the character of the shepherd, the writer of Zechariah in xiii., 7, certainly refers, by the sheep who are to be scattered, to the sinful people who are to be exiled as a punishment for their sins. Jesus, however, in his reference to the sheep, refers to his own faithful disciples who are to be scattered, not as a punishment for their sins, but as a natural result of the consternation into which they will be thrown. They will temporarily lose moral courage, be "offended." After this he is to restore and lead them. Here, then, the application totally fails. And it is to be noted that Christ's purpose here is to express his concern, not for himself, but for his disciples, the sheep.

The application of the prophecy directly and literally to Christ requires terrible stretching. This is evidenced by the far-fetched and distorted explanations of Briggs, Johnson (*The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*), and Keil. Only the necessity for holding to a preconceived idea would induce one to so wrest Scripture to its hurt. To make this prophecy direct and literal in its application to Christ is impossible; to make it typical is to distort its original significance by splitting the verse in halves; to represent Jesus as thus using is to reflect severely on his judgment in the choice of an Old Testament prediction.

But taken in the simpler sense, as the use of an Old Testament phrase to express the prediction that his followers are to be scattered as the result of the smiting of their leader, it is both natural and apt. Jesus quotes this just as we would a proverb, or a verse, or any familiar quotation. His use is purely linguistic.

## 3.—QUOTATIONS SUPPORTED BY MARK ALONE

*A Doubtful Passage*

Mark ix., 48: from Isaiah lxvi., 24.

Hebrew—Isaiah lxvi., 24: “Their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched.”

Septuagint—“Their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched.”

Mark ix., 48: “Their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”

Verses 44 and 46 in Mark, which are identical with 48, are omitted by the best manuscripts and by the Revised Versions. Mark practically reproduces the Septuagint, with a change of tense. It seems probable that this passage, unsupported by either of the other Gospels, is an expansion, in the second Gospel, of the description of Gehenna, possibly suggested by the words “of fire” of Matthew xviii., 9, and “the unquenchable fire” of Mark ix., 43. It seems to be a substitution for Matthew’s “of fire.” We should certainly not expect the writer of the first Gospel to omit an Old Testament reference. As a matter of fact we find all through this section (Mark ix., 42–49), connections that are merely verbal, where the general sense connection is not fitting. For example, Mark makes the “one of the least of these believers,” of verse 42, refer to the “children” of verse 37. Matthew appears to be following Mark in the main. This indicates a later insertion of our passage, for as we have said the writer of the first Gospel would not omit an Old Testament reference.

A comparison indicates the preferableness of Luke’s connection. Mark’s connection of verses 42 and 43 *ff.* is evidently suggested by the word “stumbling” of

verse 42, which recurs in verse 43. That Matthew found this material in two connections is indicated by its appearance in Matthew xviii., 6 *ff.*, where the first Gospel follows Mark, and again in Matthew v., 29 *ff.* The connection of Mark ix., 42 *ff.* (Matt. xviii., 6 *ff.*), is a forced one and has no point of contact except the use of one word. We have a similar verbal connection in Mark ix., 49, 50. Luke (xiv., 34) has the preferable connection in this instance and Matthew does not adopt Mark but has this in his composite chapter (Matthew v., 13).

There is abundant evidence then, in this whole section of Mark, of editorial work of a secondary character. It is pieced together by purely external connection. All this points to the conclusion that this citation of Isaiah lxvi., 24, is a part of this verbal connecting. Johnson (*The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*) attributes this to Christ and calls it a "quotation by sound." In the original prophecy this is in a section evidently composite in character. The expression, however, clearly has reference to the perpetual burning of the bodies of those who had rebelled against Jahwe. Were we to attribute this to Jesus it is to be noticed that he does not cite it as a quotation. It would be possible that he used, unconsciously perhaps, the words of the prophet. If so, this would be attributable to the fact that Jesus moved in the realm of Old Testament thought and used its language freely and naturally because of his familiarity with it. The use of the prophetic words would be merely a prophetic expression of the natural punishment of sin as something eternal. The passage has no particular significance in regard to our discussion, being in any case merely casual.

In view, however, of the facts previously cited, the

composite and secondary character of the section in Mark; in view of the fact that we can see no reason why both Matthew and Luke should omit it from the original source if it were there; and in view of the many expansions of a similar kind which the second Gospel reveals, we deem this as in all probability such an expansion, and not a genuine *logion* of Jesus.

#### 4.—QUOTATIONS SUPPORTED BY MATTHEW AND LUKE

##### *John the Baptist an “Elijah”*

Matthew xi., 10; Luke vii., 27: from Malachi iii., 1. (Compare Mark i., 2, and Luke i., 76.)

Hebrew—Malachi iii., 1: “Behold, I send my messenger and he shall prepare a way before me, and suddenly shall come into his temple the Lord, whom ye seek, and the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold he cometh, saith Jahwe of hosts.”

Septuagint—“Behold I send my messenger, and he shall examine the way before me. . . .”

Matthew xi., 10—

“This is he, of whom it is written,  
Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,  
Who shall prepare thy way before thee.”

Luke vii., 27—Identical with Matthew with a slight exception.

Mark i., 2, is identical with the other Gospels, except for the omission of “before thee.” He joins with it a quotation from Isaiah xl., 3; the two forming his introduction to the account of John the Baptist; citing the combined quotation as from Isaiah. While some texts include the words “before thee,” they are omitted by S., B., D. and L., and the reading with the omission is the better. In Luke i., 76, it also appears in the story of John the Baptist as a part of the prophecy of Zecharias.

In the section in which the quotation attributed to Jesus appears, the accounts in Matthew and Luke vary. Matthew xi., 7-11 is so nearly identical with Luke vii., 24-28 as to indicate the same source. Luke follows, however, with an insertion of his own, and then, in verses 31-35, takes up the account as in Matthew, verses 16-19. Matthew also has an insertion: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and men of violence take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And if ye are willing to receive it, this is Elijah who is to come. He that hath ears to hear let him hear." Luke, however, has the passage of verses 12, 13, "And from the days of John, etc.," "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John," in a totally different place and renders it as follows (Luke xvi., 16): "The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the Gospel of the kingdom of God is preached and every man entereth violently into it." This leaves Matthew xi., 14, "And if ye are willing to receive it, this is Elijah, who is to come," unsupported by Luke. It is to be noted, moreover, that this is the counterpart of the quotation in verse 10.

The quotation in question is textually difficult. Weizsäcker considers it an interpolation. Wendt says that "diese Worte nicht in den Logia gestanden haben, sondern von Mt., dem Lc. wieder gefolgt ist, in unseren Zusammenhang eingeschoben worden sind." (*Lehre Jesu*, Erster Theil, pages 74 *ff.*) While we do not deem Wendt's argument satisfactory, there certainly are considerations other than those mentioned by him which make its genuineness at least doubtful. The quotation in Mark i., 2, is doubtless dependent on the citations in the other Gospels. (See Holtzmann, H. C.)

First of all it is to be noted that the identity of the quotation in each case, while differing so entirely from either the Hebrew or the Septuagint, makes it evident that the original source would be the same. If the passage is genuine this source is the *Logia*.

The fact that in the only parallel to this section, the passage contained in Matthew xi., 14, concerning Elijah, which is a companion passage to the quotation, is omitted, may indicate that this is a later insertion based on Matthew xvii., 10-13, and Mark ix., 11-13, where Jesus makes a similar utterance concerning Elijah. It may then have been incorporated into the third Gospel still later. It is to be noticed that Luke has no such account of these words of Christ as to the identity of John the Baptist and Elijah. It is not at all improbable that if this verse (Matthew xi., 14) is an insertion in the first Gospel, taken perhaps from another place in the *Logia*, then Matthew xi., 10, citing the quotation, may have been added by the Evangelist. We certainly do find such additions in the first Gospel, inserted with similar intent. That is, when the writer or compiler saw a reference to an Old Testament passage, he frequently looked up the passage and inserted it.

An added evidence for this is the fact that, although Jesus is here represented as making an explicit statement regarding the appearance of Elijah in John the Baptist, later on at the Transfiguration (Matthew xvii., 10-13, Mark ix., 11-13) the disciples ask, "Why then say the Scribes that Elijah must first come?" and Jesus makes this same identification of John and Elijah. It is difficult to see why they should be troubled concerning this question if Jesus had previously made this explicit explanation. Furthermore, the identity of the citations in Matthew and Luke, while yet differing so

widely from the Hebrew and Septuagint, indicates, as Toy says, that this is a "traditional transformed Christian reading of the passage" which "had been stereotyped in an independent Greek form." (See also Plummer on Luke.) There is thus evidence of lateness, at least in the present form. Toy further says that "a similar transformation of the passage into Messianic shape may have taken place in the first Christian circles, and thence have come into the synoptic Gospels."

While these textual difficulties thus indicate doubt as to the setting, and cast suspicion on its genuineness, we have sufficient evidence that Jesus did make some sort of identification of John the Baptist and Elijah. There is, therefore, no inherent improbability about Jesus' use of such a passage, and though its present form is secondary, we deem it probable that there is a genuine *logion* back of it. Although in one sense it is perhaps the nearest approach to a literal application of prophecy by Jesus, it is yet one which directly annuls the scribal, literalistic interpretation. It is another denial of the prevailing expectation of literal fulfilment. (Compare Matthew xxii., 41-45, Mark xii., 35-37, and Luke xx., 41-44, which is a parallel case.)

The writer of Malachi attacks the religious authorities of his time, and his only word of judgment is against the false and disobedient of Israel. The book predicts God's Day of Judgment, when good and evil shall be separated. In advance of this, however, the prophet Elijah is to reappear in an attempt to bring the nation back to Jahwe. His "messenger" is to come, first, to purge the priesthood and ritual that there may be pure sacrifices; and, second, to rid the land of its criminals and sinful men. "Elijah's" mission is to convert the people before Jahwe comes upon them at

the "Day of the Lord." (See G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii.)

The section quoted by Jesus (Malachi iii., 1) has a distinctively historical sense. The messenger is Elijah (that is, *an* Elijah), the one whose way he prepares is Jahwe Himself. The reference to Elijah clearly means "a prophet like Elijah." The Jews of Jesus' time, however, holding the Old Testament Scriptures to be literally and verbally inspired, and looking for a literal and detailed fulfilment, expected to see the real Elijah as the precursor of Messiah. (See Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Second Division, ii., section 29, page 156, "The Messianic Hope.") Jesus explicitly denies this *literal* view of fulfilment, at the same time that he declares its *real* fulfilment. The passage in Malachi is not directly Messianic. It has, as we have said, a distinctively historical sense. The predictions of Malachi obtained a personal Messianic sense, however, among the Jews. This accounts for the change of the "me" of the Septuagint to the "thee" of the Gospels. This change was made to make the passage fit its Messianic meaning. As we have said, Jesus in all probability did not cite this form, this being a later stereotyped Greek form.

It is here as if Jesus said, as he does say in Matthew xi., 14, "You are looking intently for Elijah to come; but yet you knew him not when he did come, for 'if ye are willing to receive it,' if you will have it that way, this one, John the Baptist, was your Elijah."<sup>1</sup> He

<sup>1</sup>Clemen remarks: "Das rätselhafte Matth. 11, 14, scheint doch wohl nur auzudeuten, dass die Erfüllung des Propheten gar nicht in einem Einzelnen zu suchen sei—wenn sie wollten, möchten sie dieselbe indes in Johannes sehen."—*Gebrauch des Alten Testamentes*, in den n. t. S., page 30.

fulfilled the hope of the old prophet. He was a worthy Elijah and was indeed a true preparer of the way of the Lord in his preaching of repentance and of the coming of God's Kingdom and Judgment." Jesus uses the words of Malachi as a fitting description of the *character* of John. John was a second Elijah in his own character and in the nature of his work. To suppose that Jesus' concern here is to add proof to his own claims for Messiahship by declaring John as the fulfiller of a prophecy is to lose sight of his real purpose. There was no literal identity. That was what the Scribes wanted. Jesus is eulogizing John as a prophet and his purpose is to compare John with the great prophet for whom the writer of Malachi had hoped.<sup>1</sup>

### *Judgment on Capernaum*

Matthew xi., 23; Luke x., 15: from Isaiah xiv., 13-15.  
(Compare Ezekiel xxxi., 16.)

Hebrew—Isaiah xiv., 13-15: "And thou, thou hast said in thy heart: The Heavens I will ascend, above God's stars I will exalt my throne, and I will sit on the mountain of the assembly, in the uttermost parts of the north. I will mount to cloud heights, I will be like the Most High. But thou shalt be hurled down to sheol, into the uttermost parts of the pit."

Septuagint—"But thou sayest in thy thought,—To the

---

<sup>1</sup>The difference between the general New Testament conception of Elijah as the forerunner and that of the rabbinic traditions is pointed out by Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii., appendix viii., Rabbinic Traditions about Elijah, the Forerunner of the Messiah. Edersheim remarks: "From whatever source the sketch of the activity and mission of the Baptist be derived, it cannot have been from the ideal of the ancient Synagogue, nor yet from popularly current Jewish views. And, indeed, could there be a greater contrast than between the Jewish forerunner of the Messiah and him of the New Testament?"

heavens I will mount, above the stars of heaven I will place my throne, I will sit in the high mountain, upon the high mountains of the north, I will mount above the clouds, will be like the highest. But now unto Hades thou shalt be cast down, and unto the foundations of the earth."

Matthew xi., 23—"And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? unto Hades shalt thou go down."

Luke x., 15—"And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? unto Hades shalt thou be brought down."

These citations do not follow the Septuagint verbally. Toy considers them as probably from the Aramaic. The Septuagint may have been the source, however, the change of person being made to suit the application. The accounts in which this passage occurs (sections Matthew xi., 20-24 and Luke x., 13-15) are fragmentary. As a matter of fact we have no record of any works of Jesus in these places, such as are referred to as ground for the judgment pronounced on them.

The connections in Matthew and Luke are different. In the first Gospel this section appears in a collection of moral criticisms by Jesus on his age. In Luke it is a part of his address to the Seventy. This is a mere reminiscence of prophetic language. In Isaiah, the prophet adds to his prophecy of the overthrow of Babylon a satirical ode concerning her king. That Jesus uses the words cited entirely out of any connection with the Old Testament situation is evident from his comparison of Tyre, Sidon, and (in Matthew) Sodom, which, of course, has no reference to the situation in Isaiah. We have here an instance of the use by Jesus of one of the scriptural figures with which he was so familiar. This was probably a familiar passage. We have a similar phraseology in Ezekiel xxxi., 16, "I

made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast him down to sheol with them that descend into the pit." Strictly speaking, this is not a quotation. It is the mere borrowing of a scriptural description.

*Mercy ; not Sacrifice*

Matthew ix., 13, xii., 7: from Hosea vi., 6. (Compare 1 Samuel xv., 22, and Micah vi., 6-8; also Matthew xxiii., 23.)

Hebrew—Hosea vi., 6: "For [inward] love I desire and not [external] sacrifice ; and knowledge of God more than [or, rather than] burnt-offerings."

Septuagint—"Therefore mercy I desire rather than sacrifice and knowledge of God rather than burnt-offerings."

Matthew ix., 13—"But go and learn what this signifies,—I desire mercy and not sacrifice."

Matthew xii., 7—"But if ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless."

The Hebrew original may mean either "mercy" or "love," in the larger sense. The Septuagint rendering of "not" and "more than" by "rather" gives the sense better than the literal Hebrew. These passages in Matthew are nearer to the Hebrew than to the Septuagint, although several of the Septuagint words are identical. It is probable however that Matthew follows an Aramaic rendering.

Three questions arise at the outset. 1. Is this a genuine utterance of Jesus? 2. If it is, was it uttered on two occasions, or is it a case of doubling in Matthew? 3. If genuine, what was the connection or connections in which it was uttered? It seems strange that so striking a saying should be omitted by both Mark and Luke, especially by Luke. If genuine we here have evidence that Luke did not have our Gospel of Matthew nor the same *Logia* as Matthew. A con-

siderable part of one section containing this passage, Matthew xii., 5-7, does not appear in Mark and Luke. Matthew and Mark connect two Sabbath incidents as occurring apparently on the same Sabbath, while Luke connects them, but represents them as on two different Sabbaths. Matthew xii., 5-7 looks like an insertion in this place. In addition to the fact that it breaks the connection in Mark and Luke, it does not, in the first Gospel, carry out a straightforward, connected argument. The similarity between verse 5 and verse 3 *ff.* accounts for its arbitrary insertion. Verse 6, "But I say unto you, that one greater than the temple is here," does not seem fitting in the connection, for the disciples have not in any way offended with regard to Pharasaic law on Jesus' account, and they would not need his authority in the matter. Verse 7, while it has an indirect application, does not directly fit the general connection any better, for the disciples are not guiltless here especially because they have mercy or love as over against their formal law-breaking.

Verse 5 would suit some such connection as that of John vii., 23. Verse 6 is another saying similar to Matthew xii., 41, 42. Verse 7, with which we are especially concerned, would be fitting in such a connection as Matthew xxiii., 23 *ff.*, Luke xiii., 15, Luke xiv., 1-6, or possibly in reference to any of the accounts of Sabbath healing. Of course the question as to whether it would apply to the latter depends on whether Christ, speaking in Aramaic, used "mercy" in the sense which we have indicated as the prophet's use, that is, a right attitude of heart, love; or in the strict sense of "mercy." If the former, it would not be so applicable to a Sabbath-healing, where the idea would be that of compassion or mercy. The use of the word

does not determine the question, for this is the regular Septuagint translation for the original.

Turning to Matthew ix., 13, this passage is probably out of place, for with the exception of its insertion, the parallel accounts in this immediate connection agree with the first Gospel. It is inappropriate here. While the quotation is thus, in both instances, out of place, it has the ring of a genuine saying of Jesus. [Compare Mark ii., 18, Mark vii., 15 (Matthew xv., 11), and Mark xii., 33.] It is a prophetic teaching which is identical with his own: that of the ethical as opposed to the purely ritualistic service of God. Furthermore, the fact that Matthew has it twice would perhaps indicate that he found it twice and sought to find two fitting connections for it. It is a saying which Jesus might well have used twice, once in such a connection as Matthew xxiii., 23 *ff.*, and again in connection with a Sabbath-healing. At all events, the fact that it is out of a proper connection in Matthew does not argue for its ungenuineness, inasmuch as a large proportion of the material of the first Gospel is out of historical connection. On the grounds of intrinsic probability we deem it a genuine citation by Jesus.

Its meaning is clear, and it is used just as the prophet used it. In Hosea vi., 6, contained in a section in which repentance is the theme, the prophet cites as a great fault, the lack of "knowledge" in his hearers. They do not "know" God in experience. They do not comprehend him. If they did they would realize that what he desires is not external sacrifice and burnt-offerings, but a right attitude of heart and a true inward knowledge or experience of God.

Jesus repeatedly found this same misunderstanding in the Israel of his time. Suppose it to be uttered in

connection with such a passage as Matthew xxiii., 23, 24 (Luke xi., 42 *ff.*), "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy ( $\varepsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\varsigma$ ) and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone. Ye blind guides, that strain out the gnat and swallow the camel"; then adding, "Go ye and learn what this meaneth; I desire mercy and not sacrifice." Such a connection as this is eminently fitting. Jesus' use of the prophecy would be determined again by the similarity of situation, hearers, and teaching. It would be a powerful homiletic use of Scripture. Here, as so frequently, he uses the Pharisees' own weapon on them. He says, "You who are so punctilious for the outward observance of law, and who criticise me for not observing an external ordinance, go and look to the Scriptures which contain the law and see what they themselves say, go and learn what this meaneth, Mercy, inward love, I desire and not external sacrifice." The quotation was as fitting a one as Jesus could have cited to bring out the clear distinction between the ethical and the ritual, a distinction which he traced to the very nature of God, as did the prophet before him. A preacher to-day could find no more striking text for the same sermon.<sup>1</sup>

#### *The Sermon at Nazareth*

Luke iv., 18, 19: from Isaiah lxi., 1, 2. (Compare Isaiah lviii., 6, and xlii., 7.)

Hebrew—Isaiah lxi., 1, 2: "The spirit of the Lord Jahwe is upon me, because Jahwe hath anointed me to bring good

---

<sup>1</sup>On the insertion in Matthew's connections, see Holtzmann, *Neue Testamentliche Theologie*, vol. i., pages 142–147.

tidings to the afflicted ; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim to the captives release, and to the prisoners deliverance [opening] ; to proclaim a year of grace of Jahwe and a day of vengeance for our God ; to comfort all mourners."

Septuagint—"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to announce good news to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to proclaim to the captives release, and to the blind recovery of sight, to announce an acceptable year of the Lord, and a day of requiting ; to cheer all the mourners."

Luke iv., 18, 19—"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to announce good news to the poor, he hath sent me to proclaim to the captives release, and to the blind recovery of sight, to send away at liberty the crushed, to proclaim an acceptable year of the Lord."

Verses 20 and 21: "And he closed the book and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down : and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears."

The Septuagint of this passage follows the Hebrew in the main. The Hebrew refers to the opening of a prison—deliverance. The Septuagint translator rendered the word in its usual sense, of opening the eyes, and this necessitated taking the following word as "bound" in the sense of blindness. The Septuagint may have been influenced in this by Isaiah xlii., 7. Luke follows the Septuagint almost verbally, except that he abridges and transposes and adds in order to complete this "programme" of Christ's ministry. The clause which he omits from Isaiah lxi., 1, 2, is found in a few texts of Luke, but is lacking in **S.**, B. D. L., most manuscripts of the Lat. Ven., the best of the Vulgate, all the best editions, and the R. V. In

those manuscripts where it occurs it was probably a later insertion to complete the quotation. (See a similar instance in Matthew xv., 8 *ff.*) Among conjectural explanations of these changes that of Toy (*Quotations in the New Testament*, page 79) is reasonable. "Luke evidently follows the Septuagint; and the error here came from a Septuagint scribe, who misread his Hebrew manuscript, or had a corrupt text. By the change of certain letters, the Hebrew of the clause omitted by Luke becomes the same with that of Isaiah lviii., 6, and may have been similarly translated by some Greek scribe in the margin of his copy of the Septuagint."<sup>1</sup>

We may suppose that a Septuagint scribe, by error of eye, omitted the clause "to heal the broken-hearted," and that another, perceiving the omission, repaired it by the insertion of this new translation, which, however, he introduced in the wrong place, either through inadvertence, or to avoid the juxtaposition of two similar words. It would have read literally, "he sent me to send the crushed into liberty." Luke, or some later scribe of Luke's Gospel, followed this erroneous Greek text."

Luke's wording possibly indicates an Aramaic version. While such a conjecture as Toy's indicates only a possibility, the general identity of Luke with the Septuagint indicates this as the most probable source. Jesus, of course, did not use the inserted expression from Isaiah lviii., 6, although Lightfoot tries to explain it by the fact that it was lawful to skip from one passage to another in the reading of the prophets. There is nothing in the nature of the case to indicate such a probability here, however, and undoubtedly the words,

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Hebrew of Is. lxi., 1, and Is., lviii., 6.

as Jesus read them, would be practically identical with our Hebrew. We have no proof of the existence of an Aramaic version at this time.

This visit to Nazareth is probably that of Matthew xiii., 53-58, Mark vi., 1-6, and John, chapter iv.; although this has been disputed (*see* Godet). The accounts do not agree, however, as to its place in the course of Jesus' ministry. Matthew, Luke, and John place it earlier than Mark. It would seem as though Mark put it too late and Luke certainly too early. Mark here seems to be moved by subjective reasons, placing it at the close of a series of great works to make a climax. Moreover, Mark's connection at both beginning and end is a loose one. With regard to Luke's connection, if verse 23 is in place here, the reference to Capernaum would seem to prevent it from occurring as early as this (*see* Luke iv., 31-41). It is probable, however, that verses 23 and 24 are not in their proper setting. They interrupt the discourse. Of course it is possible that Luke may have combined two accounts. But there are apparent editorial reasons for Luke's placing the sermon here, namely, as a fitting introduction, "*Programmstück*," to his story of Christ's ministry, along with the account of the temptation. Notwithstanding that we cannot accurately locate the incident, and that Luke alone records it, it bears the inherent marks of historicity.

#### *The Original Prophecy*

Regarding the announcement in Isaiah 1xi., opinion among scholars is divided as to whether this refers to the prophet himself or to the "servant of Jahwe." Delitzsch, Driver, Briggs, and at last accounts Cheyne, who formerly thought otherwise, and others, apply it

to the servant. On the other hand, Ewald, Dillman, and Krüger, with many others, apply it to the prophet himself. G. A. Smith, "while feeling that the evidence is not conclusive against either," inclines to think that "there is, on the whole, less objection to its being the prophet who speaks than to its being the servant." (*Book of Isaiah*, vol. ii.) He adds further, "But it is not a very important question which is intended, for the servant was representative of prophecy; and if it be the prophet who speaks here, he also speaks with the conscience of the whole function and aim of the prophet's order."<sup>1</sup>

The fact that the servant is not mentioned, as in at least nearly all other passages where introduced; that the servant's discourse never elsewhere passes without transition to that of Jahwe, as it does here in verse 8, while this is a common practice in the speech of the prophet; that several words are terms used of the prophet and not of the servant; and that the whole tenor of the passage indicates the announcement of a prophetic mission, inclines us to apply it to the prophet who has been speaking in chapter ix. It is a felicitous summing up of the substance of the best Old Testament prophecy.

In any event, however, the use of the prophecy by Jesus would not be changed. The Targums preface the passage with these words, "The prophet says." Although the Targums are by no means altogether reliable authority and are late, they do reflect the traditions of pre-Christian Judaism. Furthermore, while the application of the "servant of Jahwe" to certain

<sup>1</sup> See further, Delitzsch, *Com. on Isaiah*, vol. ii., and Krüger, *Essai sur la Théologie d'Isaie*, and G. A. Smith, *Commentary on Isaiah*, vol. ii.

sections of Isaiah appears in such works as the Wisdom of Solomon, this section is not so applied. So, whatever a later exegesis and interpretation may decide as to Isaiah lxi., it is altogether probable that Christ used the quotation with the view of its original application to the prophet himself. As G. A. Smith says, "On the whole, then, we must be content to feel about this passage, what we must have already felt about many others in our prophecy, that the writer is more anxious to place before us the whole range and ideal of the prophetic gift than to make clear in whom this ideal is realized." Such would be the conception of Jesus.

The prophet is speaking to the exiles in Babylon and declares himself as the messenger of Jahwe to proclaim the end of their captivity and their restoration to their rightful, blessed relationship with Jahwe. "The spirit of the Lord Jahwe is upon me, because Jahwe hath anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim to the captives release, and to the prisoners deliverance; to proclaim a year of grace of Jahwe and a day of vengeance for our God; to comfort all mourners; to offer to the mourners of Zion, to give unto them a diadem for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the mantle of praise for the spirit of faintness; so that men may call them Oaks-of-Righteousness, the planting of Jahwe, that he may break into glory."

The "afflicted" or "poor" is the prophetic designation for God's people in exile. To these, the prophet brings the news of their release and restoration. This means their pardon, their return to their relation with Jahwe as his people, their future blessedness and prosperity. Following this announcement the prophet goes on and describes the blessedness of the future in ex-

ternal terms, painting a graphic picture of a united Israel in Zion.

*Christ's Use of the Prophecy*

It is not without fitness that the third Evangelist has placed this passage at the beginning of his story of Jesus' ministry, as an epitome of it; although, as we have seen, the historical occasion was later. Jesus came to Nazareth where he had been brought up, and, as his custom was, entered into the synagogue on the Sabbath. Early in his ministry he took his place in the synagogue as a teacher. He began his ministry as a Jew, among his own people. This incident represents him thus. The custom was to read the first lesson from the law, which occupied the first rank among the Rabbis, and the second lesson from the prophets. Jesus is apparently represented as making a different choice, which he might possibly do, on account of his preference for the prophetic books. But this is doubtless a report of the incident recounted long after its occurrence and we cannot press such details. It is not unlikely that the selection from the law had been read and that Jesus was selected as the reader of the second lesson for the day. For this reading there was no *lectio continua*. A choice was open, and this was often left to the reader. The narrative seems to represent Jesus as making the selection. He opens the book and reads from Isaiah lxi., "The spirit of the Lord Jahwe is upon me, because Jahwe has anointed me to announce good news to the meek: he has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim to the captives release, and opening to the bound; to proclaim a year of grace from Jahwe." Note the point at which the reading

stops, omitting the clause, "a day of vengeance for our God."<sup>1</sup>

The narrative goes on, "and he folded the roll and gave it back to the attendant and sat down; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears." That Jesus said more than this is indicated by verse 22, "and all bare him witness, and wondered at the *words of 'Grace'* which proceeded out of his mouth." Does the word refer to grace of manner or style, or is it to be taken in the theological sense? It seems probable, in view of the Pauline character of the teachings attributed to Jesus in the narrative which follows, that it means the latter, words about Grace, concerning the Grace of God. This is the general use of *χάρις* by Luke.<sup>2</sup>

Following this, Jesus is represented as announcing, with illustrative citations of Old Testament examples, a prophetic universalism with regard to God's Grace, which plainly indicates the passing over of the blessings of the Gospel from unworthy Israel to the receptive Gentiles.<sup>3</sup> The result of this continued exposition

<sup>1</sup>The Vulgate adds to iv., 19, "et diem retributionis," but this reading is not supported.

<sup>2</sup>On this question, see Luke's use of the word in Acts xiv., 3, and xx., 24.

<sup>3</sup>On verses 23, 24, which seem to interrupt, see Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, vol. i., p. 166, sec. 34 b. These are probably genuine sayings of Jesus but do not belong here. They receive support as to their genuineness from the recently discovered "Sayings of Jesus," *Logion* vi., ii., 30-35: "Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither does a physician work cures upon them that know him." (See Harnack, *Über die Fünfst Entdeckten Sprüche Jesu*, and Grenfell and Hunt, *Sayings of Our Lord*.)

is the tumultuous wrath of his hearers, which results in his forcible ejection from synagogue and city.

Let us consider the significance of this incident as represented by the third Evangelist. While it is going too far to attribute to the third Gospel a defined Paulinism, in the theological sense, there is one point at which its writer is in thorough sympathy with Paul. That is, in his Christian universalism. All flesh is to see the salvation of God (iii., 6). In his account of the sending of the Seventy, which is probably identical with the sending of the twelve (compare x., 4, with xxii., 35, the latter of which refers only to the Twelve), just as the Twelve corresponded with the Twelve Tribes, so Luke's Seventy corresponds to the reckoning of the nations of the world, on the basis of the tenth chapter of Genesis. The Seventy thus symbolized the sending of Christianity to the whole world. Moreover we find Jewish-Christian passages of the first Gospel apparently omitted by Luke, such as the instruction not to go to the Gentiles or Samaritans; and the saying of Jesus that he was not sent except to the lost sheep of Israel (Matthew x., 5, xv., 24).

Here, as we have previously suggested, we have a reason for the evidently subjective setting of the incident we are discussing. It is a significant announcement of the *Universalism* of the Gospel. Verses 25-27 are the commentary on Jesus' preaching on Grace (22), for which the prophetic quotation (18, 19) forms the text. According to the narrative we have, then, *Jesus' concern is not primarily with a teaching about himself*. It is a statement of the *universal* nature and application of his Gospel. It is to be noted that it was not because of anything he said regarding his own person that he was cast out of synagogue and city; but because of his

unwelcome announcement of a Gospel of God's Grace, not for Israel alone, but for the despised Gentiles. This is the unmistakable representation of the writer of Luke. Significant is the omission of the phrase "the day of vengeance of our God." For this phrase in Isaiah referred to God's judgment on the heathen who had oppressed Israel. Hence, the quotation being used here as a text especially for the announcement of salvation for the heathen, this phrase would not be fitting.

It is clearly evident that Jesus' purpose at Nazareth was not primarily to make an announcement concerning his own person. To be sure this would be included. He does herald a new dispensation, which he is conscious of inaugurating. But it is certain that he is not, as Briggs (*The Messiah of the Gospels*, page 237) infers, concerned to announce and prove his Messiahship. This is the usual explanation of the passage, but the exegesis which comes to this conclusion treats only of the section iv., 16-22, and ignores its significant commentary in verses 25-27. It discusses the text of Jesus' sermon without any reference to the sermon which Jesus preached on the text. It is evident that Jesus' hearers would infer from his utterance no more than that he applied to himself the words, and claimed as his the mission of his great predecessor, the prophet of the Exile; thus claiming himself to be a prophet sent to declare God's universal Grace.

Thus, in view of the whole tenor of this section, and in view of the fact that the passage quoted from Isaiah is not a description of a personal Messiah, it is evident that in his use of prophecy here, Christ is not concerned to relate an Old Testament prediction to his personal Messiahship. It is even too much to say, as does Pro-

fessor Briggs, that "in this he definitely claims to be the gentle preacher described in the great prophecy of the Exile." It is truer to say that he takes the words which the great prophet used, descriptive of his own mission, and uses them as applicable in a description of his (Christ's) mission, as the greatest of prophets. Although in Isaiah the words are inclusive of a larger truth, they yet relate to a miraculous removal of earthly wants and sufferings, and to an establishment of external salvation and prosperity. Christ transforms them into a spiritual sense, with little or no regard to their literal tenor; and uses them in a figurative way to express God's purpose to free men from sin. Their fulfilment in him is nothing literal. Here as elsewhere he uses prophecy and represents it as fulfilled in himself because it consummates the larger ideal of the Old Testament hope. (Compare Matthew xi., 4, 5, Luke vii., 22.) He completes the prophetic work.

Taken as a whole, then, we have here a sermon by Jesus, his subject being "The Boundless Grace of God." He takes the prophetic words descriptive of the Gospel of Grace taken from Isaiah, as a text. The order would be:

1. The text; describing the nature of the Grace of God (verses 18, 19).
2. This is the substance of the message and revelation of Christ (verse 21).
3. The further exposition of the text. God's Grace is in its nature universal, founded on men's needs, not on their prerogatives (verse 22).
4. The truth of this is illustrated by Old Testament examples which indicate the boundlessness and universality of God's Grace (verses 25-27).

*The Stone of Stumbling*

(Matthew xxi., 44); Luke xx., 18: from Isaiah viii., 14, 15.  
(Compare Daniel ii., 34, 35 and 44, 45.)

Hebrew—Isaiah viii., 14, 15: “And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a snare and for a trap to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and taken.”

Septuagint—“He shall be to thee as a sanctuary, and not as of a stone stumbling shall ye encounter, neither as the falling of a rock. But the houses of Jacob in a snare and in a hollow lying in ambush in Jerusalem. Wherefore shall be weak among them many and they shall fall and be crushed and men shall draw near and shall wander in safety.”

Aramaic—Daniel ii., 34, 35, 44, 45: “Thou sawest until a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken in pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great rock, and filled the whole earth. . . .

“And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand forever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain and its interpretation sure.”

Septuagint—Theodotion: “Thou sawest until a stone was detached from a mountain without hands, and smote the image . . . and the stone which smote the image became a great mountain and smote the whole earth.

“ . . . Just as thou sawest that the stone was cut from the mountain . . .”

Matthew xxi., 44—“(And he that falleth on this stone shall

be shattered to pieces : but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him like chaff.)”

Luke xx., 18—“Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces : but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him like chaff.”

The Septuagint of the Isaiah passage is altogether incorrectly rendered. The different manuscripts vary, some approaching nearer to the Hebrew than others. Matthew xxi., 44, is bracketed by W. and H., and omitted by Tischendorf. Its practical identity with the Luke passage, and the manuscript evidence, make it more than suspicious. Luke xx., 18, however, has good textual support. We have already discussed this incidentally, in connection with the passage Mark xii., 10, 11, and parallels, quoted from Psalm cxviii., 22, 23. Luke xx., 18, which is left unsupported by the setting aside of Matthew xxi., 44, may be out of its connection here, and may have been inserted in this connection because of the verbal likeness of the word “stone.” However, this evidence is lessened by the fact that the passage Luke xx., 18, itself uses this word with relation to two references. It may be the writer’s own comment, and in any event, is not without suspicion. It is probable that the figure of the stone in the first half, “every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces,” refers to the figure in Isaiah viii., 14, 15; while the second half, “but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust,” refers to Daniel ii., 34, 35, and 44, 45. There is no antithesis in the intended result. This applies only to the method of destruction.

There seems to be a threefold play on the word “stone.” In Luke xx., 17, it is used in reference to the “corner-stone” of Psalm cxviii., 22, 23. In Luke xx., 18, it refers, first, to the stone of stumbling in

Isaiah viii., 14, 15; and, second, to the stone which “brake in pieces” the image, and caused it to be like the “chaff of the summer threshing-floor.” The term *πιπτω* in the first half of Luke xx., 18, might refer to the stone in Daniel as well as in Isaiah, in the sense, not of stumbling upon, but of coming into collision with. It is, in any case, difficult to establish any clear, concise, and direct reference. The terminology and the figure, however, do seem to establish some connection with the Old Testament passages. The stone of stumbling was doubtless a common figure. (See Jeremiah vi., 21.) We shall best see what Christ’s reference may have been by an interpretation of the saying in Luke xx., 18.

In the section containing Isaiah viii., 14, 15, the prophet is appealing to the people. He has sketched the evils which are to fall on Judah and Israel through the coming of the Assyrians at the call of Ahaz. Confederacies and alliances with the nations are no real source of strength. God alone is this. Neither should they fear Rezin and Pekah; God should be the object of their fear. “Say ye not, a conspiracy, concerning all whereof this people say, a conspiracy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be in dread thereof. Jahwe of Hosts, him shall ye sanctify; and let Him be your fear, and let him be your dread.” Then the prophet goes on to describe the twofold attitude of God towards men; according as they seek and honor, or neglect and reject him. As Prof. G. A. Smith puts it, “God is the one great fact of life, but what a double-edged fact!” He is “a sanctuary” to all who put their trust in him, but a “stone of stumbling” and a “rock of offence” to both houses of Israel; a snare and a trap to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. In consequence of their lack of

trust, "many of them shall stumble and fall and be broken and be snared and taken." A similar figure is used in Jeremiah vi., 21, and Ezekiel iii., 20. In the first half of Luke xx., 18, Jesus is represented as applying this figure to himself. The idea is the same as in Matthew xi., 6, "blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me." Again in Matthew xiii., 57, they were "offended" or "caused to stumble" in him, says the Evangelist, they rejected him without sufficient cause.

Turning to the passage, Daniel ii., 34, 35, and 44, 45, we find the reference is to a stone, mysterious in its origin, which smote the kingdoms of the earth and broke them in pieces. In Daniel vii., 14 and 27, and chapter ii., 44, this conquering kingdom is that of the "Son of Man"; of "the people of the saints of the Most High"; and of "the God of Heaven." Jesus is represented as also borrowing this figure and applying it to the relation of men to himself.

There is no actual identity between Luke xx., 18, and the Old Testament passages referred to. Jesus merely borrows the figure (which the prophet applied to God), and under it sets forth the result to those who, instead of looking to him in earnest desire for truth, stand off in captious criticism, close their eyes to his truth, to his personal significance, and thus find in him, not a stone of foundation, but a stone to stumble over. But there is another class on whom his judgment falls, because of their actual sins. For these he borrows the figure of Daniel, and declares a like destruction for them. He sees before him those who stand in both these attitudes to him; and he utters this solemn warning to these who oppose him, his teaching, and his kingdom, both by outspoken opposition, and

by the moral opposition of their judgment-deserving lives. Every one that falleth on this stone shall suffer loss. Like loss shall come to those on whom this stone falls in judgment. Whoever comes into hostile collision with him, either as assailor or assailed, will suffer destruction. Christ does not use the figures with regard to their special use in the Old Testament. He merely borrows figures which are both fitting and rhetorically striking.

### *Reckoned with Transgressors*

Luke xxii., 37 : from Isaiah liii., 12.

Hebrew—Isaiah liii., 12 : “Therefore will I divide him a share with the great, and with the strong shall he share spoil ; because he poured out his soul unto death, and with transgressors he was numbered, and (in that) he bore the sin of many and interposed for the transgressors.”

Septuagint—“Therefore he shall inherit much, and of the strong he will divide spoil ; because his soul was given up to death, and among the transgressors he was reckoned, and he bore the sins of many and on account of their sins he was given up.”

Luke xxii., 37—“For I say unto you, that this which is written must be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned with the transgressors ; for that which concerneth me cometh to an end.”

With reference to other clauses in the passage the Septuagint rendering is incorrect. Luke uses the terms of the Septuagint, but gives the sense of the Hebrew. This would indicate an Aramaic original as the source of the quotation. This section, Luke xxii., 35-38, is a fragment peculiar to Luke. It occurs in connection with the Supper, and follows directly after Christ's prediction of Peter's denial. It seems out of connection here. In any case, we have not a direct, continued discourse, although these words may all have been

spoken during the last meal. Is this a genuine saying? Verses 36 and 38 naturally connect and this looks like an interruption, although of course it may be parenthetical. Mark xv., 28, which is now omitted by all received texts, reads after giving in xv., 27, the account of the crucifixion of the two robbers with Christ, " and the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was reckoned with transgressors." This was undoubtedly an addition by a later copyist. Our passage in Luke may be a similar insertion.

There is no doubt that the early Christian writers were under a special necessity to represent Christ's death in conformity to prophecy. The Messiah's death constituted the great difficulty and was at first a "stumbling block" in the apologetic of the early Church. Hence there was more need for conforming it to prophecy. For example, in Mark x., 33, 34 (Matthew xx., 18, 19, Luke xviii., 31-33), where Jesus announces that he goes to his fate at Jerusalem, Luke alone has, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man . . ." (Compare also Luke xxiv., 44-46, Luke xiii., 33, both peculiar to Luke.) Hence we can see a dogmatic purpose for the insertion of this passage as an explanation of after occurrences. (See Mark xiv., 49, for such an instance.) It looks as though some hand had been at work on this Gospel in this dogmatic interest. There are instances in this Gospel of "reading-back." That is to say, prophecies and other sayings are moulded by the later facts. Especially is this true in the Infancy story.

On the other hand, its appearance in Luke alone may be accounted for on the supposition that Luke and Matthew had different editions of the *Logia*, for it is

always hard to see what would induce the writer of the first Gospel to leave out an Old Testament reference, especially of a "fulfilling" character. Moreover, the section of Isaiah from which this is taken was doubtless a familiar one to Jesus. The addition of Mark xv., 28, might indicate the earlier presence of this passage in Luke.

But perhaps we shall form a more decided opinion on the grounds of inherent probability; that is, by seeking to ascertain what would be the content of the saying on Jesus' lips. Let us look at the passage quoted. Some commentators interpret Isaiah liii., 12, as referring to the prophet himself; the majority, however, consider the prophet as referring to the "Servant of Jahwe," who, himself righteous, wins righteousness for many and bears their iniquities (liii., 11). The Servant of Jahwe (the righteous kernel of Israel) refers to the godly among the Babylonian exiles, who, though righteous themselves, are yet treated, like their unrighteous brethren, as transgressors. The Servant's suffering is vicarious. And because of this, it is his very humility that elevates him, for his service makes him the highest among the moral forces of life: "Therefore do I divide him a share with the great, and with the strong will he share spoil; because he poured out his soul unto death, and with transgressors he was numbered, in that he bare the sin of many and interposed for the transgressors." The significance of the Servant lies in his vicarious and intercessory attitude. He thus becomes the Saviour of God's people. This is the thought of the whole chapter. All this is represented as by God's own decree. It accords with the general prophetic idea of the saving remnant.

That Jesus is not giving this quotation as having

been said of himself is evident from his own words. He does not say that the words written "concerning him" were to be fulfilled. He says the words written were exemplified in him. The expression might indicate specifically that the words were originally spoken of some one else. Jesus means here, "the course of my life (what concerns me) hath or cometh to an end." (So Mark iii., 26.) Hence, textually and exegetically, anything like direct reference to Christ is excluded by the form of expression attributed to Christ. There is a question which frequently arises when the question of literalness in Christ's quotations comes up. It was a question which troubled the Manicheans. It is this: If Christ regarded the passage as having direct reference to him, either literally or typically, why did he not quote the whole passage? The question here is determined largely on the significance of  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ . While we shall treat this at length in another chapter, we may suggest here that a comparison of the places where it is used shows that at least there are cases where nothing like direct, precise, literal fulfilment can possibly be meant.

Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, page 362) sees in the sin-bearing Servant of Isaiah liii. an individual prophet, and thus seems to find it easy to make a very literal application to Jesus Christ. He says (page 363):

"The prophet finally represents that this suffering has been in order to accomplish a divine plan of redemption. He suffers in obedience to the divine appointment. He offers a trespass-offering for the sins of the people, in order to purchase their redemption thereby. The trespass-offering has as its idea the payment of a fine in compensation for neglected duties and breaches of the divine law. His death is such a substitution and compensation for sin. When this has been accomplished, the condition of humiliation has come to an end, and the

exaltation of the servant begins. *There is no explicit mention of a resurrection, but this is implicitly involved*, for he who has died a martyr's death must rise from the dead in order to receive the rewards of his service. The rewards are success in his ministry, the enjoyment of the spoils of his victory, and exaltation to great honor as the redeemer. *This prophecy of the servant who dies and rises from the grave, finds its only fulfilment in the death of Jesus Christ, and in his resurrection and exaltation to his heavenly throne.*<sup>1</sup>

Again Professor Briggs says (*The Messiah of the Gospels*, page 332), after speaking of the great Sufferer of the exilic Psalms: "He is the same as the suffering Servant of the great prophet of the Exile, and their combined representations portray to us the passion of our Saviour with such an intensity that they exceed the historical narratives of the Gospels in coloring and in realistic effect." In a similar vein, Delitzsch, with reference to the passage we are discussing, says, "Every word here is, as it were, written under the Cross on Golgotha." Frankly, I say I do not believe it. Thus to put into the words of the prophet a prediction of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is an exegesis excusable in Philo and the Apostles, but not in a nineteenth-century critic. To sustain such a literal

<sup>1</sup> As to the matter of a belief in the resurrection in the Old Testament, we refer the reader to the various discussions on the question. Of course the generally accepted view of modern scholars is that there is practically nothing of a belief in immortality in the Old Testament. Said George Adam Smith, in the Lyman Beecher Course at Yale University, in 1899, "For the most part the Old Testament shows an amazing indifference to the subject," and his conclusion is that we find little but lurid flashes of hope for immortality. I quote from my own review of Professor Smith's lectures in the *Congregationalist* of April 27, 1899. This fact alone lends improbability to Professor Briggs's interpretation.

interpretation requires that we consider the prophet as a mere unconscious mouthpiece. That the early Church had some such conception there is, of course, no doubt. Such was the conception of the copyist who inserted Mark xv., 28. But if we look aside from the mechanical Messianic application of the Evangelist and look for the natural meaning, it would be this:

In the previous verse (36) Jesus intimates that his disciples must soon be left to rely on themselves and that they are to meet deadly hostility. (*See John xv., 18-21.*) He is here concerned, *not to set forth anything in relation to himself*, but with relation to his disciples. Hence, if there is any analogy between this passage and the prophetic reference to the servant of Jahwe, it might well be between the disciples and the servant. Jesus says: "The world will treat you no better than it does me, and in me must be accomplished (to me is applicable), in the nature of the case, the word which Isaiah spoke when he said, 'He was reckoned with transgressors,' for I am about to be treated as an evildoer. If then they thus treat the leader, so will they treat the followers. Be ready for this, for my course of life reaches its culmination in this approaching event, my apprehension as a law-breaker, and my death." Let it be especially noted that all through this passage and in its context, the concern of Jesus is not for himself; he is not setting forth himself; he is speaking of the disciples.

Looked at naturally, then, in his use of the quotation from Isaiah, Jesus merely borrowed a figure. He used this just as we might use any proverb or familiar quotation, equally applicable in a thousand different ways.

It is quite likely that the recorder interpreted it

differently. We need, throughout our whole discussion, to keep in mind the bias under which the Gospel writers and editors labored. And yet the Greek verb here is one which has for its general Aramaic equivalent a word seldom if ever used for "fulfilment" in the sense of the coming to pass of a prediction. We should not care to rest much on this, however, for there was a wide difference between Christ's use of certain words and the later interpretations of the recorders of his words.

### *God the Teacher*

John vi., 45: from Isaiah liv., 13.

Hebrew—Isaiah liv., 13: "And all thy sons (shall be) disciples (taught) of Jahwe, and great (shall be) the peace of thy sons."

Septuagint—"And all thy sons taught of God, and in great peace thy children (shall be)."

John vi., 45—"It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me."

The Septuagint renders the Hebrew except that it translates Jahwe:  $\theta\acute{e}ov$ ; and it connects this with what goes before, whereas the Hebrew begins a new sentence. John vi., 45, rests on the Septuagint in its use of the words, but the citation is a free one, altered to fit the manner of discourse. The freeness of the citation is indicated by the "it is written in the prophets," referring to the prophets in general and not to any specific prophet. Jeremiah xxxi., 33, 34, conveys a similar teaching. So Joel ii., 28-32, and iii., 1, 2. So Micah iv., 1-6. It is a quotation of the substance, and is really not cited as a quotation but stated as a prophetic teaching. The use of the prophecy here is somewhat similar to that of Isaiah lxi., 1, 2, quoted in Luke iv., 18, 19,

in so far as it is an application of the Old Testament description of the Kingdom of God as proclaimed by Christ.

In Isaiah this is in one of three addresses contained in chapters liv., lv., and lvi., 1-8, which were delivered just before the return from exile. Chapter liv. is describing Israel in its ideal future, and after speaking of Zion's external beauty the writer turns, in verse 13, to describe her righteousness, resting on a restoration of her true relation with Jahwe. He represents Israel as being in such close and spiritual relation with Jahwe that she shall be, not man-taught any longer, but God-taught. Jesus' use of the prophecy is an instance of his ability, so far above the teachers of his time, to select such Old Testament sayings as were in spirit attestations of his own teachings, and it is in part the fact that he is represented as doing so here that leads us to accept the quotation as made by him. While there is no doubt that the writer of the fourth Gospel, in chapter vi., as elsewhere, is setting forth a theological conception, which in the exact form given is the Evangelist's own and not Christ's, we yet find the Saviour's own teaching concerning himself. The idea of verses 44 and 45 is that without the divine grace and its drawing power no man can come through Christ to God. A divine enlightening of human faculties is necessary. The inner ear must hear God's voice. Faith is influenced by God. It was just this that his hearers, according to John's account, lacked. This teaching is not unlike, in substance, the teaching in the Synoptists, in which the receptiveness and unreceptiveness of men is similarly grounded. Similar teaching is found in Mark x., 27, where God's power enables men to enter of the Kingdom of Heaven, without which

power it would be impossible. (Compare also Mark xiii., 11, Luke x., 21, Mark iv., 11, vii., 6, 8 *ff.*)

Nor is the further conception here set forth, of Jesus' relation to God, and of himself as the means of approach of men to God, a pure subjective conception of the writer. These ideas are found in the Synoptic teaching. In Luke x., 22, he says: "All this has been delivered unto me of my father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal." Indeed this is the fundamental assumption of Jesus' teaching regarding himself. The condition of membership in the Kingdom of God, according to the Synoptists, depends on relation to him. (On this see Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, English Translation, vol. ii., sec. 3, chap. vii.)

Further, while it is true that the writer of the fourth Gospel does at times so interweave his own statements into the discourses of Jesus as to make it difficult to know which may be the actual words of Jesus, and which his own comments, thus making it possible to regard verse 45<sup>a</sup> as an insertion of the writer to refer the origin of Jesus to Old Testament proof; the connection of 44 and 45<sup>b</sup>, while broken by it, may as well be attributed to Christ as to the writer. For Christ is here talking to "the Jews" who murmur against him, and on some such occasion he may well have used, as he so frequently did, their own weapon against them. Moreover, the very unliteralness of the quotation leads us to decide in its favor as authentic in Christ's mouth. It is such a passage, not as the Evangelist would have chosen, but as Christ himself would choose, not because it contained any possibility of literalizing, but because of its spiritual affinity with the truth he utters.

There is no literal correspondence. In Isaiah liv., 13, there is no suggestion of mediation. God himself is represented as the actual teacher of men. In the Isaiah passage the emphasis is on "all," while Jesus lays emphasis on "taught of God"; quite a difference in idea. So, whatever may be the Evangelist's idea, it does not seem that Christ used it at all in a proof-sense. It is as if Christ said, "No man can come to me, except the Father draw him."<sup>1</sup> To use a prophetic word, 'All men are taught of God' and all who receive such teaching into open, willing hearts, will come unto me, for in me they will see the messenger of God.' Here then we have merely a use of prophetic language, suitable because of spiritual affinity with the thought and mission of Christ. Christ is not quoting the passage so much as a statement of the Messianic times as fulfilled in him (although this idea need not be excluded), but rather for the sake of expressing the general idea that God is the teacher of men and that those who allowed themselves to be thus taught would see in Jesus the true Messiah of God. His whole purpose, then, is not to rest his Messiahship on the Old Testament, but to teach the truth that spiritual enlightenment is the free gift of God, open to all men, an enlightenment which, if accepted, would enable his hearers to recognize him and his truth. He quotes the prophet's words not as a prediction but as a statement of this truth: "God is the great teacher."

#### *An Unknown Reference*

John vii., 38—"He that believeth on me, as the scripture saith, from within him shall flow rivers of living water."

<sup>1</sup> The refrain, "and I will raise him up at the last day," is not fitting, and is in any case an addition of the writer, or of a later editor.

It is difficult to trace the source of this quotation, and indeed it would not be considered as such were it not for the words, "as the scripture saith."

It has been variously referred to such passages as Isaiah xii., 3, xlivi., 20, xliv., 3, lv., 1, lviii., 11, where the figures are in a very general way similar. Or to such passages as Joel iii., 18, Zechariah xiv., 8. Some have found here a reference to the smiting of the rock in Horeb, Exodus xvii., 6, Numbers xx., 11. Other writers have concluded that it refers to some apocryphal or lost saying; and Ewald suggests the fragment of Proverbs no longer extant, as its source. Toy (*Quotations in the New Testament*, page 85) refers it to Proverbs xviii., 4, and the reader is referred to Toy's discussion of the passage, which is interesting, but by no means conclusive. We have here a figurative expression similar to the words of Jesus to the woman of Samaria in John iv., 10, and iv., 14. An interesting question arises as to whether the two accounts in the fourth Gospel rest on the same tradition, with words of like import to these.

It is certain, however, that we have nothing here upon which to form an estimate of the use of the Old Testament citation, and indeed it is by no means necessary to suppose that Christ made a definite reference. It may well be, as some have suggested, that he refers to certain passages of Scripture which have been read at the celebration in which he is represented as participating, and takes them for his text, referring to them in a general way and adopting the figures used. We are inclined to agree with Professor Stevens (*The Johannine Theology*) who says, "the preferable view is that the general import of Scripture respecting the fulness of blessing in the Messianic age is here indicated, in

view, especially, of such passages as employ the figure of a stream or spring in describing that blessing." In any case the citation bears no mark of literalness, but is a free rendering, the adoption of Scripture language in the teaching of a spiritual truth.

*A Skilful Defence*

John x., 34: from Psalm lxxxii., 6.

Hebrew—Psalm lxxxii., 6: "I said, Ye are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High."

Septuagint—"I said, ye are gods, and all sons of the Most High."

John x., 34—"Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?"

The Septuagint quotes the Hebrew identically and John reproduces the Septuagint as far as the quotation goes. The method of use of the Old Testament in this instance is similar to that found in other passages we have treated. It is an *argumentum ad hominem* appeal similar to that in Mark x., 6 *ff.*, and Mark xii., 26. It is especially like Mark ii., 25 *ff.*, and Matthew xii., 7. In John we find a similar use in vi., 45, viii., 17, v., 17, and vii., 22 *ff.* It shows us that intimacy with Scripture which sometimes caused astonishment in Jesus' hearers (Mark i., 22, and especially Luke iv., 22).

Jesus, here, as we often saw in the Synoptic accounts, uses his hearers' own weapons on themselves. The expression "in the Law" refers to the Law in the general sense of the Old Testament Scripture, as in vii., 49. The "your" does not lay emphasis on its being their law and not his, but is a part of his *argumentum ad hominem*, to show their false view which considered the law as theirs in the sense that it is on their side, as unfavorable to him; while really the reverse was the actual case.

In the Psalm quoted from, the words are addressed to Israel's unrighteous and unjust judges. The writer contrasts their lofty office with their unworthy administration of it. This office was one by nature so exalted that they, as representatives of God, were even called "gods." "Gods" is applied in the Old Testament to men, and only with certainty to judges. (Compare Exodus xxii., 8 and 28.) The term applied in Psalm xlv., 7 (6), to a Jewish king is textually, and as to meaning, not certain. The general idea is that in their official capacity they are representatives of God.

In the section in which our quotation occurs, the Jews had accused Christ of blasphemy because he had spoken of God as his Father and declared that he and the Father were one (x., 29-33). Jesus, realizing that in this charge they had reference to the Law, turns on them with the question, "Is it not written in the Law, which you accept and on which you base your charge —these words, 'I said, ye are gods' unto whom the word of God came? If, then, he could call them gods (and if the Scriptures cannot be broken), how can ye say of me, whom the Father has sent into the world as his messenger and representative, Thou blasphemest, because I apply to myself, not the term 'God,' but because I said, I am the son of God?" (Verses 34-36.) Wendt's commentary on this is so clear and complete that we cite it:

"In the relative clauses, in which Jesus first characterizes those who in the Old Testament (Ps. lxxxii., 6) are called gods, and then characterizes Himself, He gives at once the reason why the Divine name was ascribed to them, and why He can call Himself the Son of God. He finds the explanation of that Old Testament designation in the fact that the men, who are there mentioned, had become partakers of the Divine word; whether it was that He referred to the Divine relation in

general, or whether He referred to a particular commandment which they had received from God. We cannot perfectly determine whether this explanation was a usual one among the scribes in the time of Jesus. It was, however, self-evident to Jesus that, in the Holy Scriptures, the Divine name could be applied to men, not on account of an earthly power and greatness which made them comparable to God, but only on account of their relationship to the one God, and on account of their participation in what is truly of God. To this basis of the attribution of the Divine title to those addressed in the words of the Psalm, the basis which He gives for His self-designation as Son of God stands in such a relationship of similarity in kind and of degree, that he could draw a just conclusion *a minori ad majus*. For the being sanctified, that is, consecrated, the pertaining to God, and the being sent into the world by God, which He declares of Himself, He knew as resting on a revelation, whose medium God as His Father had, in His fatherly love, made Him, but whose possession He, on His side, maintained in fidelity and manifested by His works, to which He was called among the Jews (vers. 32, 37 f.) Now, if the Scripture could already describe as gods those Old Testament receivers of the revelation of God, how should not He who, through the Divine revelation He had experienced, felt Himself in fullest measure as God-consecrated and sent by God into the world, indicate this fellowship with God through the name of the Son of God? Also by His designation as He whom the Father has sanctified, Jesus does not proclaim for Himself such a relation to God as essentially distinguishes Him from His disciples."

Jesus disclaims any denial of monotheism in his appeal to Scripture. The phrase "and the Scripture cannot be broken" is not categorical but hypothetical. (Holtzmann.) The meaning is, "If then he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and if the Scriptures are to stand, etc." As to the question whether in thus assuming the title Son of God, Jesus does so in a human or divine sense, our passage seems to show that it is in the human sense. Beyschlag (*New*

*Testament Theology*, vol. i., page 244) says this “is a defence which would be meaningless and even false, if to him the Son of God were not a human being in the same sense as those ‘gods.’”

We have, then, here, an example of the detailed use of Scripture by Jesus. How unlike it is to that which a later exegesis extracted! Jesus’ use again demonstrates his marvellous ability to choose such sayings as were attestations of his teachings and which brought out clearly the one-sidedness and perverseness of the literalistic and piecemeal method which prevailed with his opponents. His use here is dialectical, and yet by no means sophistical.

### *A Significant Interpolation*

John xiii., 18: from Psalm xli., 10 (9.)

Hebrew—Psalm xli., 10: “Even my familiar friend (the man of my peace), whom I trusted, eater of my bread, hath set his heel against me.”

Septuagint—Psalm xl., 10: “Even the man of my peace, in whom I hoped, eater of my bread, hath made great (his) heel against me.”

John xiii., 18—“But that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth my bread (or, eats bread with me) hath lifted up his heel against me.”

The Septuagint renders the Hebrew exactly. Indeed, as frequently, it renders it so slavishly as to change the real expression by failing to render it in the Greek equivalent. The quotation in John is a very free rendering. There is no doubt, however, that this passage in the Psalm is the passage referred to. Westcott (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, page 283) suggests that the writer was familiar with the Hebrew text. This may be so, or the quotation may be from a later Greek translation. We think it probable that it is such a free translation.

The authorship and date of Psalm xli. cannot be definitely settled. That it belongs to a persecution period seems certain. Baethgen and others refer it to a post-exilic period, when Israel was the object of a hostile attitude on the part of surrounding nations. The sufferer is Israel and the "familiar friend" is perhaps Edom. (Baethgen, *Handbuch zum A. T., Die Psalmen*.) While Messianic in the larger sense, there is nothing personally Messianic in it; no reference to a future person. The question as to whether verse 19 implies that Jesus cites this in order to turn an event which might be a cause of stumbling to the disciples into a means of support; or whether he is, as Weiss thinks, presenting a proof for his Messiahship, does not alter the fact that the fourth Evangelist directly and literally connects a passage from the Old Testament with "fulfilment" in a specific event of Christ's life.

We have here a quotation which is entirely different from any of those we have been discussing. It is a purely mechanical literalism which connects the supposed individual referred to in the Psalm with Jesus. Any spiritual connection between the two passages it is impossible to find. Finding thus in the fourth Gospel a quotation so much at variance in every way with Christ's method and grounds in quoting Scripture, we need to give the passage most thorough consideration.

This verse is contained in those sections of the fourth Gospel (chapters xiii.-xvii.) which evidently contain what purport to be a series of addresses by Jesus at the Last Supper. The account throughout is full of breaks, both in historical and literary continuity. This has given rise to various questions and to as many conjectures, in an effort to obtain a proper order. With this, however, we are not concerned. We need only to

recognize that the section is not, as it stands, a harmonious unity. For example, note that while xiv., 31, apparently ends the meal, xv., 1, continues the address and we have still another conclusion later. The discourse is further continued to chapter xvii., and we have the other conclusion in xviii., 1.<sup>1</sup>

There is also lack of unity in the section which contains our quotation. A merely casual reader notices the lack of connection between verse 20 and that which precedes. The opening words, "Verily, verily," require immediate connection with something preceding. Such a connection and a unity is established if we connect verse 20 with verse 17, and the preceding. Thus verses 18 and 19 form one of those parenthetic passages which we find so frequently interrupting the connection throughout the fourth Gospel.<sup>2</sup>

While we may not accept conclusions such as Wendt's, as to the double nature of the Gospel, we see that it does contain interruptions which do not seem to belong to the original source of the Gospel, or at all events to the original words of Jesus.

We find in the fourth Gospel a very evident attempt to make it clear that Jesus, by a supernatural knowledge, knew what was in man (ii., 25), and that especially in reference to Judas the Master was in nowise deceived; that he knew from the very beginning that he had chosen one who was to betray him. In xiii., 10, the clause "but not all" is to except Judas. In xv.,

<sup>1</sup>For a careful and thorough discussion of this question the reader is referred to Spitta: *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, page 168, "Jesu Abschiedsreden."

<sup>2</sup>See Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, Erster Theil, "Die Evangelischen Quellenberichte über die Lehre Jesu," page 221. Also Cone, *Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity*, page 249 ff.

2, the branch that beareth not fruit probably refers to the betrayer. In vi., 64, where Jesus' words evidently refer to the disciples in general (verse 61) who murmured at his hard saying, they are given a most unnatural application to Judas by this explanation of the Evangelist, "For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him." In vi., 70, 71, we have an insertion where Jesus is represented as saying, "Did not I choose you, the twelve, and one of you is a devil? Now he spake of Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." This "answer" of Jesus has no connection here, and is entirely inappropriate to the preceding words of Peter, declaring Jesus as the Holy One of God. There is no connection at all between Peter's declaration and this reputed word of Jesus. In this Last Supper (xvii., 12) Jesus is represented as adding, "But the son of perdition; that the Scripture might be fulfilled." This has a wholly unnatural sound. The writer probably refers to Psalm cix., 8, "Let another take his office." That this is an insertion in the course of Jesus' prayer is apparent. It is a parenthetical modification by the writer. We see, then, throughout the fourth Gospel, explanatory references to Judas's betrayal, all of which are evidently editorial additions or insertions, commentaries on Jesus' words in the light of events which occurred long after the sayings of Jesus.

Let us look at the passage we are discussing. In this quotation, the first clause of the verse in the Psalm, "in whom I trusted," is designedly omitted, in order to avoid any admission that Jesus was deceived in Judas.

The accounts of the betrayal, both in the Synoptists

and in John, have difficulties. With relation to the direct prophecy that one of the twelve was to betray him these accounts render as follows:

Matthew xxvi., 21 *ff.* "And as they were eating, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began to say unto him every one, Is it I, Lord? And he answered and said, He that dipped his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. . . . And Judas, who betrayed him, answered and said, Is it I, Rabbi? He saith unto him, Thou hast said."

The first intimation, "He that dipped," is not direct, but the final one to Judas does appear to be direct. This is at variance with John xiii., 26 *ff.*, where verse 29 precludes it. It is probable that Matt. xxvi., 25, containing the words to Judas, is from a later tradition. Mark did not originally contain it.

The account in Mark xiv., 18 *ff.*, is as follows:

"And as they sat and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray me, even he that eateth with me. They began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? And he said unto them, It is one of the Twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish."

This contains no direct intimation of Judas.

In Luke xxii., 21 *ff.*, we read that Jesus said:

"But behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. . . . And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing."

The Synoptic accounts are thus in substantial agreement. The fourth Gospel disagrees with them entirely. John xiii., 25-27 represents Jesus as conveying to John (so generally considered) and Peter a direct intimation

that Judas is to betray him, but (28, 29) to no one else. The inherent improbability of the account in the fourth Gospel, as well as the agreement of the Synoptic accounts, leads to the conclusion that that in the fourth Gospel has been worked over. This account of the designation to Peter and John probably rests on a later tradition. It was used by the writer, or editor, of the fourth Gospel in the interest of his effort to show that Jesus was not deceived in Judas. It bears the same marks of improbability as all those editorial comments which we have previously considered. All this accords with the theological purpose of the Gospel. It is a part of its form; of its scheme. (Chapter ii., verses 24, 25.)

Seeing, then, that the Johannine account of this whole scene is beset with impossibilities, and that it contains later insertions, we are not surprised to find what we have previously said looks on the face of it like an interpolation, this later editorial comment (chapter xiii., verses 18, 19) which contains our quotation. The fact that none of the Synoptists have anywhere anything corresponding to this quotation is evidence against it. Matthew especially would not have omitted it.

But there is a further and weightier reason for excluding verse 18 as a *Logion* of Jesus. If our consideration thus far of Jesus' use of prophecy has shown us anything, it has shown that in every case where Jesus used prophecy there is an affinity of spiritual truth between the Old Testament passage cited and the use of it in Jesus' teaching. This is true in those passages where, according to some authorities, a literal connection has been found possible. The spiritual significance is always there. But here we have a method of using prophecy, common enough to the fourth

Gospel, but not to Jesus. It is purely literal and mechanical, with no spiritual significance whatever. It is, moreover, inserted in a connection where Jesus' teaching is of the highest spiritual importance. It is the selection of a passage which, in relation to its context in the Psalm, is utterly inapplicable to Jesus. The Psalm contains complaints of the writer which are purely personal to himself (typifying the nation, probably); and if any part of it is applicable to Christ the rest must be. Yet who would say that the words, "For I have sinned against Thee," are applicable to Christ? The whole Psalm has a revengeful spirit. It is thus a purely mechanical and verbal selection. How unlike the method of Jesus!

Wherever we find the apostolic writers led into allegorizing in such a way as this, it is generally done with reference to something in the context which suggests to their minds the Old Testament passage. In the present instance we find this suggestion in the Synoptic account. It is in Mark xiv., 18, "He that eateth with me." This suggested to a writer living later, in an age which felt itself forced to prove the Messiahship of Jesus by a hermeneutical method of this kind, the reference in Psalm xli., 10. He either incorporated this into the later tradition which he inserted into the interpolation, verses 18 and 19; or else made a marginal reference which afterwards became incorporated into the text.

#### *A Passage which Shows how Jesus did not Use Scripture*

John xv., 25: from Psalm lxix., 5 (4.) (Compare Psalm xxxv., 19, cix., 3, cxix., 161.)

Hebrew—Psalm lxix., 5: "More than the hairs of my head are they that hate me without cause."

Septuagint—Psalm lxviii., 5: ". . . they that hate me undeservedly (or, without cause) . . ."

John xv., 25—"But in order that the word which is written in their law should be fulfilled, that, They hated me without a cause."

The Septuagint translates the Hebrew literally. John xv., 25, is probably adopted from the Septuagint. While it is uncertain whether this citation is based on Psalm lxix., 5, or xxxv., 19, the sense would not be changed in either case, for in both Psalms the reference is to the writer's enemies. The expression "in the law" refers to the Law according to the Jewish usage, meaning the teachings of the Old Testament as a whole. If Jesus cited this, his use would be similar to that in Luke xxii., 37, merely the adoption of a scriptural phrase. He would apply the experience of the original writer to himself. Both were unjustly hated. Anything like a literal, or, what is practically the same thing, typical application would be grotesque. It would be like the unnatural application which we have already pointed out in John xiii., 18. For if we take the reference in Psalm lxix., 5 (4), and regard the writer as literally or typically representing Christ, then we must in the same way apply the verse which continues, "O God, Thou knowest my foolishness; and my sins are not hid from Thee," as typical of Christ.

If, on the other hand, we refer it to Psalm xxxv., 19, then we have a selection, made to typify Christ, out of a Psalm which is full of a revengeful spirit, and we have this writer typifying Christ while he says "Let their way be dark and slippery"; "Let destruction come upon him unawares"; "Let them be put to shame and confounded together"; "Let them be clothed with shame and dishonor." No; if Jesus chose passages typical of himself, he did not seek them in the imprecatory Psalms. If Jesus used such a quotation, from such

a source, it could only be as the adoption of a current phrase, a scriptural designation, in this case, of unjust treatment.

But a careful study of the section shows us clearly that the conception of the writer of the fourth Gospel was not like this. He makes it distinct and definite, "in order that" the word written in their law should be fulfilled, meaning, "this has occurred in order to fulfil." Weiss recognizes this evident meaning of the passage, and so is forced to assert that the Evangelist puts these words in the mouth of Jesus, the Messiah, as proof of his Messiahship. (Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*.)

Johnson (*Quotations of the N. T. from the Old*, page 245) is forced even further, and says: "The quotation is probably from Psalm 1xix., 4, which we have found Messianic in so many other passages, the Psalmist speaking of himself, *but so speaking under the guidance of the Holy Spirit as to become a type of Christ*, since the things he speaks are fulfilled *perfectly in Christ*, and only *imperfectly in himself*." This is a case of *reductio ad absurdum*, for in this instance, as we have seen, this same writer, "a type of Christ," writing words and descriptions which were to be "fulfilled perfectly in Christ," continues the words in which he is typifying Christ, "O God, Thou knowest my foolishness; and my sins are not hid from Thee." To say that the writer, in one half of his utterance, is typical of Christ, and in the half which continues it, is not, is to wrest the Scripture to its hurt. Any such argument falls of its own weight.

But while we have seen that any such use of Scripture is absolutely foreign to Christ, lacking in all moral value, it is by no means foreign to early Christian ex-

egesis and interpretation. It was the prevailing method at the time of the writing of the fourth Gospel. We find it all through this Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

This passage (xv., 25) clearly interrupts the course of the discourse and looks like an insertion. The natural connection is between verses 24 and 26. This is a similar kind of insertion to those which we considered in our discussion of John xiii., 18. It is an inserted comment of the writer. If we should put verse 25 in parenthesis (as a writer inserting his own comment would do to-day) all would be clear. That the writer of this Gospel, or that the Gospel in its present form, does pass from the words of one speaker to the words of another, or to the writer's own comments, in this loose way, we have evidence. Note, for example, chapter i., verses 6 to 8 and verse 15, which are evidently parenthetical. In chapter iii. there is a transition from the words of Jesus to the writer's own words, beginning, probably, with verse 16. There is another similar transition from the words of John the Baptist to those of the writer, beginning with verse 31.<sup>2</sup>

We shall, moreover, notice the especial category to which this insertion (xv., 25) belongs, if we note an

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of this feature of the fourth Gospel the reader is referred to the clear presentation by Professor G. B. Stevens in the *Johannine Theology* (Chapter ii., "The Relation of John's Theology to the Old Testament"). See also Cone's *Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity*, chapter x., page 309, "The Old Testament in the Gospels."

<sup>2</sup> For a consideration of this peculiarity, upon which Wendt in large part bases his theory of the composite character of the Gospel, the reader is again referred to the discussion in Wendt's *Lehre Jesu, Erster Theil, Vierter Abschnitt*, "Das Johannesevangelium." See especially chapter ii., "Die Unterbrüchen," u. s. w., page 219.

insertion of the same import which is more clearly shown, by the context, to be the writer's own comment. This is in xii., 38 *ff.*, where the writer adds the words,

"that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake,

Lord, who hath believed our report?

And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?

For this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah said again,

He hath blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart;

Lest they should see with their eyes, and perceive with their heart,

And should turn,

And I should heal them.

*"These things spake Isaiah because he saw his glory; and he spake of him."*

In these words of the writer we have clearly presented his conception of the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in Christ. Note the opening of the phrase, "in order that it should be fulfilled." This is identical with our passage. Thus it is evident that the quotation in xv., 25, is an explanatory insertion of the writer. As to whether it is to be attributed to an original or a later compiler, we shall decide in accordance with whatever our theory may be with regard to the unity of the Gospel and the contemporaneity of its various parts. It may originally have been a marginal comment which slipped into the text. But in any case, because of the entire absence of any affinity with Christ's method of using Scripture, its similarity with other editorial comments, added to the textual evidence, which in itself is weighty, we cannot consider this as a citation of Jesus.

## CHAPTER III

### SOME CONCLUSIONS WITH REGARD TO THE SOURCES AND TEXTS OF THE QUOTATIONS

In all, we have discussed twenty-one quotations from "The Prophets" by Jesus. Of these, Mark ix., 48, bears the marks of an editorial addition. John xiii., 18, and xv., 25, give similar evidence; and John vii., 38, has no traceable source. Not including these, we have seventeen which are genuine utterances of Jesus.

Of these, fifteen are in the Synoptics, as follows:

In all three Synoptics, seven.

In Mark and Matthew, two.

In Matthew and Luke, two.

In Matthew alone, one.

In Luke alone, three.

Of these, nine are contained in both Matthew and Luke, twelve in Luke, twelve in Matthew, nine in Mark.

### *The Gospel Sources*

Of the fifteen citations in the Synoptists, nine appear to belong to the Mark source as follows:

Mark iv., 32 (Matthew xiii., 32, Luke xiii., 19).

Mark iv., 12 (Matthew xiii., 14, 15, Luke viii., 10).

Mark xi., 17 (Matthew xxi., 13, 14, Luke xix., 46),

although the original form of the passage is best preserved in Matthew and Luke.

Mark xii., 2 (Matthew xxi., 33, Luke xx., 9).

Mark xii., 10, 11 (Matthew xxi., 42, Luke xx., 17).

Mark xii., 36, 37 (Matthew xxii., 44, Luke xx., 42).

Mark xiii., 12 (Matthew x., 21, Luke xii., 53).

Mark vii., 6, 7 (Matthew xv., 8, 9).

Mark xiv., 27 (Matthew xxvi., 31).

With relation to Mark iv., 32, and parallels, while Mark seems to be the original source, it is likely that this was also in the *Logia* of both Matthew and Luke as well. Only two seem to have the *Logia* as the original, namely, Matthew xi., 10 (Luke vii., 27) and Matthew xi., 23 (Luke x., 15). One citation (Matthew ix., 13, and xii., 7) is peculiar to Matthew and would indicate, either that it was only in Matthew's *Logia* or in an independent source of the first Gospel. Three (Luke iv., 18, 19, Luke xx., 18, and Luke xxii., 37) appear to be either from Luke's version of the *Logia* or from an independent source.

That a large proportion of these citations should appear to come from the Mark source rather than from a *Logia* source is what we should expect. These quotations have a distinctively historical character and are only understood when in their historical setting. These conclusions cannot be too strongly insisted upon. The above division rests on general indications that have appealed to the author. Where Matthew and Mark have the same historical setting, we generally see added indications that the writer of the first Gospel is following the original Mark source. The same is true of Luke. But any tabulation of this kind must necessarily be one made on the basis of indications rather than of actual evidence. Then, too, the results are

largely determined by one's presuppositions as to the synoptic problem itself.

### *The Old Testament Sources*

The following seem to be citations more or less directly from the Septuagint:

1. Mark iv., 12 (viii., 18; Matthew xiii., 14, 15, Luke viii., 10). Matthew quotes identically.
2. Mark xi., 17 (Matthew xxi., 13, Luke xix., 46), with abridgments.
3. Mark xii., 2 (Matthew xxi., 33, Luke xx., 9). Septuagint terms in the main.
4. Mark xii., 10, 11 (Matthew xxi., 42, Luke xx., 17), where Matthew and Mark are identical.
5. Mark xii., 36 (Matthew xxii., 44, Luke xx., 42), where they are practically identical.
6. Luke iv., 18, 19, where Luke probably follows an erroneous Greek text.

In the fourth Gospel:

1. John vi., 45, freely cited.
2. John x., 34, identical.
3. John (xiii., 18), freely cited probably.
4. John (xv., 25), probably a free adoption.

In the following cases it is difficult to trace the source of the quotation:

Mark iv., 32 (Matthew xiii., 32, Luke xiii., 19).

Mark xiii., 12 (Matthew x., 21, Luke xii., 53).

Mark xiv., 27 (Matthew xxvi., 31).

Luke xx., 18.

In Mark xiv., 27 (Matthew xxvi., 31), an Aramaic rendering is indicated, Mark being nearest to the Hebrew. In Mark vii., 6, 7 (Matthew xv., 8, 9), while there are differences, the Septuagint seems to have been the source, yet influenced perhaps by an Aramaic ver-

sion. In Matthew xi., 23 (Luke x., 15), the agreement with Luke in differing from the Septuagint, while yet near to it, indicates the influence of an Aramaic rendering. In Matthew ix., 13, and xii., 7, although Septuagint words are used, there is evidence of an Aramaic original, Matthew reproducing the Hebrew rather than the Septuagint. The same is true of Luke xxii., 37, where the sense is that of the Hebrew. In Matthew xi., 10 (Luke vii., 27) both agree in differing from both Hebrew and Septuagint and a late, stereotyped Greek form appears.

It is evident that the main source of the recorders was the Septuagint.

### *The Gospel Renderings*

In only two cases are the Synoptists supported by the fourth Gospel:

Mark iv., 12, and parallels; John ix., 39 and xii., 40.

Mark xi., 17, and parallels are supported by John ii., 16, where, however, only a part of the quotation is given, and that only in substance.

Cases of entire textual agreement are few. Mark vii., 6, 7, and Matthew xv., 8, 9, practically agree. Matthew xi., 23, and Luke x., 15, are in agreement. The three Synoptists are in practical agreement textually in Mark xii., 36, 37, Matthew xxii., 44, Luke xx., 42.

In two cases we have the phenomena of a longer form in Matthew, and a shorter in Luke, than that of the original Mark:

Mark iv., 12 (Matthew xiii., 14, 15, Luke viii., 10). Here Matthew's expansion is in the form of editorial completion.

Mark xii., 1 (Matthew xxi., 33, Luke xx., 9).

In Mark xii., 10, 11 (Matthew xxi., 42, Luke xx., 17), Mark and Matthew agree, while Luke again has a shorter form. Luke also abridges slightly in the passage Mark xi., 17, Matthew xxi., 13, 14, Luke xix., 46. In only one case do we have a longer form in Luke than in Matthew and Mark : Mark xiii., 12, Matthew x., 21, Luke xii., 53, where Matthew and Mark agree. In only one case has Mark a longer form than Matthew and Luke: Mark xi., 17 (Matthew xxi., 13, 14, Luke xix., 46).

### *The First Gospel*

The first Gospel departs from the Septuagint rather more than the others and its writer seems to have used either a Hebrew or Aramaic original. We find only one quotation in Matthew alone (ix., 13, xii., 7), which we found to be a genuine saying, but inserted in wrong connections. While we cannot charge the writer with consciously changing Jesus' words, he does sometimes give them his own peculiar form.

In one case we have evidence of a verbal change with the evident intention of softening a "hard saying" (xiii., 14, 15). We find three instances of apparent expansion: Matthew xiii., 14, 15 (Mark iv., 12, Luke viii., 10), where the writer, or editor, of the first Gospel adds the full quotation which was cited by Jesus only in substance. In Matthew xxi., 33, there is a slight verbal expansion. In Matthew xxi., 42, there is an explanatory addition (43). In one instance especial pains is taken to bring out the idea of fulfilment (Matthew xiii., 14, 15). The first Gospel, in general, cites more fully than the others.

*The Second Gospel*

Only one passage is peculiar to Mark (ix., 48), an evident expansion in the second Gospel. We have seen that Mark is the original source of a large proportion of the quotations, and that as a rule the most original form appears here.

*The Third Gospel*

We found three instances peculiar to Luke, one being of especial significance. The passage Luke iv., 18, 19, is either to be traced to his independent historical source; or else its substance is to be considered as sayings from his *Logia* for which he attempted to find a suitable setting. It is altogether probable that it came from his historical source. Luke xx., 18, is of uncertain source and connection. Luke xxii., 37, is unconnected, and while of doubtful authenticity has no decided grounds against it. In his delineation of the "parable" in xx., 9 *ff.*, the writer of the third Gospel does considerable allegorizing on his own account. In general he quotes freely and frequently abridges.

*The Fourth Gospel*

In John we find only two quotations from the Old Testament which seem to rest on genuine *Logia* of Jesus. Both are from the Psalms. A third (vii., 38) appears to be a quotation, but its source cannot be traced. It is to be noted that the quotations peculiar to the fourth Gospel are largely from the Psalms, a book which he uses fruitfully for his purpose, and which was used by later writers in the interest of Messianic fulfilment. In one case (Mark iv., 12, Matthew xiii., 14,

15, Luke viii., 10), where Matthew goes beyond the other two Synoptists in the interest of the literalistic view of "fulfilment," he is supported by John in ix., 39, and especially in xii., 39, 40, with added explicitness and directness. The author deals freely with the Old Testament, is verbally careless, and in quoting is concerned only to give the substance. In his general handling of Old Testament prophetic material, turning everything into "fulfilment," he is at one with the writer of Matthew.

### *Some Variations*

The variety in the representations in the Gospels is indicated by some other instances of textual disagreement. In Mark xii., 1 *ff.*, Matthew xxi., 33 *ff.*, Luke xx., 9 *ff.*, the Synoptists evince a difference of understanding as to the application of Jesus' illustration to the prophets. They proceed to allegorize on their own accounts in different degrees. In Mark xii., 36, Matthew xxii., 44, Luke xx., 42, they represent differently Jesus' main point and purpose in his dialectic. In Mark iv., 12, Matthew xiii., 14, 15, Luke viii., 10, Matthew refers the saying to the method of teaching, Luke to the meaning of the parable, while Mark is ambiguous. In Mark xii., 1, Matthew xxi., 33, Luke xx., 9, Luke represents the address as to the people, Matthew and Mark to the leaders. In the introduction, Matthew xv., 8, 9, the order of Mark vii., 6, 7, is reversed. While Matthew xi., 23, appears in a collection of sayings, Luke x., 15, is in the address to the Seventy. The placing of Matthew xxi., 33, differs from Mark xii., 2, and Luke xx., 9. Verbal changes in Luke xiii., 19, were necessitated by a placing which differs from

that of Matthew xiii., 32, and Mark iv., 32, and by a different interpretation. We find incidental differences with regard to the immediate occasion in the passage Mark xii., 36, Matthew xxii., 44, Luke xx., 42, although the general setting is the same. Differences of introduction occur in the same passage. The quotation in Mark xii., 10, 11, Matthew xxi., 42, Luke xx., 17, is introduced by different formulas. Our consideration of Mark iv., 32, Matthew xiii., 32, Luke xiii., 19, revealed differences in the representation, made necessary on account of the differing conceptions of the writers.

We found several instances where the wording of the quotation was changed from that of the Old Testament source. In Mark vii., 6, 7, Matthew xv., 8, 9, it is the clause thus altered by both Septuagint and Gospels that makes the real point of the saying. In Mark xiv., 27, Matthew xxvi., 31, the source itself is in doubt and the change may be due to Jesus' own free citation. We have a late stereotyped Greek form of citation in Matthew xi., 10, Luke vii., 27. A change, to suit the application, is made in Matthew xi., 23, Luke x., 15. In John vi., 45, the form is altered to fit the manner of discourse. Again in Mark xi., 17, Matthew xxi., 13, 14, Luke xix., 46, we have changes of construction, to accommodate the passage to its use. In two cases we have evident borrowing from one Gospel and later insertion in another; Mark i., 2, being from Matthew xi., 10, Luke vii., 27; and Matthew xxi., 44, taken from Luke xx., 18. In Luke iv., 18, 19, we have an error in quoting, which represents Jesus as uttering a clause which he did not utter.

Aside from legitimate changes to suit the discourse, we may say that these citations in general are characterized by freedom, carelessness, and inexactness.

*Formulas of Quotation*

We have next to consider the various formulas by which the quotations of Jesus are introduced. We have seen, in our discussion of the textual nature of the citations, that these formulas vary, and we do not discover any uniformity which seems to indicate any special significance. In referring to the Scriptures, Jesus is represented as using, not only in the places we have discussed, but in other references to the Old Testament, such terms of introduction as we find in the following cases:

In the reference to John the Baptist in Matthew xi., 10, Luke vii., 27, we have *οὗτος εστιν περι οὐ γεγραπται*.

In Matthew xxvi., 24, Mark xiv., 21, Jesus says that the Son of Man goeth *καθὼς γεγραπται περι αὐτοῦ*, and in Mark ix., 13, they did unto John the Baptist *καθὼς γεγραπται επ' αὐτοῦ*, and again in ix., 12, the Son of Man was to suffer, for *πῶς γεγραπται επι τον υἱον τον αὐθρωπον*.

In the passage Mark xiv., 27, Matthew xxvi., 31, he introduces an illustration in Mark by *οτι γεγραπται* and in Matthew by *γεγραπται γαρ*.

In another appeal to Scripture, where he is answering the adversary, the introduction in Luke is *γεγραπται* and in Matthew *γεγραπται γαρ* (Matthew iv., 10, Luke iv., 8).

In the passage Mark xii., 10, Matthew xxi., 42, Luke xx., 17, we have, variously: Mark, *οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταυτὴν ανεγνωτε*. Matthew, *οὐδεποτε ανεγνωτε εν ταῖς γραφαῖς*. Luke, *τι οὐν εστιν το γεγραμμένον τούτο*.

In Luke xxii., 37, we have *λεγω γαρ υμῖν οτι τούτο το γεγραμμένον δει τελεσθηναι εν εμοι*.

In his appeal in justification of the cleansing of the temple in Matthew xxi., 13, we have *γεγραπται*, the same in Luke xix., 46; and in Mark xi., 17, *γεγραπται οτι*.

In Luke xviii., 31, we have the following phrase: *και τελεσθησεται παντα τα γεγραμμενα δια των προφητων των οιων του ανθρωπου.*

While Matthew xxiv., 15, refers to *το ρηθεν δια* Daniel; Luke xxi., 22, has “days of vengeance *του πλησθηναι παντα τα γεγραμμενα.*”

In other places we have such expressions as *ο Θεος ειπεν* (Matthew xv., 4); and *Μωυσης ειπεν* (Mark vii., 10).

Mark vii., 6, and Matthew xv., 7, render variously: *καλως επροφητευσεν Ἡσαΐας . . . ως γεγραπται;* and *καλως . . . Ἡσαΐας λεγων.*

In Mark xii., 36, we have *Δαυειδ ειπεν εν τω πνευματι τω αγιω;* where Matthew xxii., 43, has simply *εν πνευματι;* and Luke substitutes *εν βιβλω ψαλμων.*

We have now to consider the use of the verb *πληρωω*. In classic Greek this verb means “to fill,” “to make full”; sometimes “to satisfy,” “to complete”; also a general meaning, “to fulfil,” “to accomplish,” “to perform.” In the New Testament it is used in a variety of senses:

1. to make full;
2. to complete;
  - a. a number;
  - b. to render perfect;
- c. to accomplish, to carry through to the end;
3. to realize, carry into effect;
  - a. to perform a duty;
  - b. to bring to pass, to satisfy, to accomplish.

Where the Evangelists themselves use the term to refer to prophecy in such ways as *ινα* or *οπως πληρωθη*, it seems to refer in their minds to an accomplishment of the prophecies in a direct and literal sense.

In Christ's use we see a somewhat broader conception. It is first to be noted that his use of this term in quoting prophecy is infrequent. In the sermon at Nazareth, Luke iv., 18, 19, he says, "To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears," where his use is that of an *application* of the prophetic description. In Luke xxii., 37, "For I say unto you that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors . . ." where the verb used is *τελεσθηναι*, meaning, "accomplished"; "It must come to pass." Here the wording indicates that Christ is not represented as speaking of the prophetic word as something written of him.

In Luke xviii., 31: "He took unto him the Twelve and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written through the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man." The word here is *τελεσθησεται*, where there is an indefiniteness of meaning. This is Luke's special term.

Jesus is represented as using *πληρωσαι* in the phrase "to fulfil all righteousness." (Compare further Luke xxi., 24, xxii., 16, John iii., 29, xvii., 13, and, most significant of all, Matthew v., 17.) A glance at these places and the other uses of the term in the New Testament will show that while the formula *ινα πληρωθη* and other forms of the verb may be taken as introducing a prediction which is "fulfilled," in the idea that the thing was written concerning this event, it is not for this purpose only. These terms are likewise used for comparison of events. In this latter case

it means that the prophet's words may be fittingly applied to the case in question. Still, it must be admitted that where the *Evangelists* use the phrase in quoting Old Testament Scripture in connection with events in Christ's life, they probably do it with the idea of a literal accomplishment in Christ. Such a passage as John xii., 41, illustrates this.

But we have the phrase used so infrequently by Christ in such connections, that we cannot definitely confine him to any such significance. His most significant use is Matthew v., 17. We shall defer consideration of the term as used here until we have completed our discussion, as we shall be able to see just what Christ meant by "fulfilling" the prophets after we have considered his use of prophecy. A comparison of all these instances shows us clearly that we have no guide with regard to the formula of introduction, as to whether the case has predictive significance or whether it is merely used illustratively.

With regard then to the use of the verb  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega$ , it is evidently used freely.

With regard to  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$ , used in various ways: this phrase is one used of any writing. It referred simply to the matter as in a written document.

As to the variety of use in all these terms: this is due to the fact that each writer had his own peculiar literary method in the matter.

This uncertainty seems to be rendered almost hopeless. The Evangelists have of course attributed their own interpretation of a term to Christ. Then, too, it must be remembered that we cannot determine the actual terms used by Jesus. For example, we find the writer of the third Gospel using  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$  where the other writers would undoubtedly have used  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega$ . It is

not easy to determine just what Aramaic word Christ used.

One or two observations will make this clear. In general the Greek equivalents for Aramaic words, as we find them in the New Testament, are Septuagintisms. And it seems probable that this was their rule so far as they had any rule. The verb *πληροω* is the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew **מָלָא**, “to fill” and “to fulfil.” Sometimes it is used for **כָּלָה**, “to complete” “to finish”; while *τελεω* is generally used for **כָּלָה**.

The Hebrew **מָלָא** is the word most generally used in the sense of fulfilling, as of a prophecy or prediction. The nearest that **שָׁלֵם** comes to this is its use for the performance of a vow. It is not used in the Old Testament in the sense of fulfilment of prediction. The word **כָּלָה** is used (Ezra i., 1) of the carrying out of a word given, but this is not strictly the sense of fulfilling a prediction and it is not used in just this latter sense. Thus generally the word **מָלָא** is the word that we should expect to have rendered by *πληροω* and used in the meaning of prophetic fulfilment. But this is not its first meaning. To say that a thing is fulfilled, using this word, does not necessarily mean fulfilment of prediction. This is a secondary meaning.

Now the four Gospels use *πληροω* in a variety of senses, but their use of it in application to predictive prophecy is perhaps the most frequent. In two noticeable exceptions, Luke uses *τελεω* where we should naturally expect *πληροω*; namely, Luke xviii., 31, and xxii., 37. In the Syriac Palimpsest the Syriac equivalent for the Hebrew **מָלָא** is generally given for *πληροω*. But in Luke xviii., 31, we have the Syriac equivalent

for שָׁלֵם for Luke's *τελεω*; while again in Luke xxii., 37, we have מְלָא for *τελεω*.

The above observations cannot be said to lead us to any definite result. And that is what they have been adduced for. The fact is, we cannot determine the meaning of Jesus when he says a thing is "fulfilled," by merely assuming prediction. But commentators have generally assumed that when it is said that such and such a thing is fulfilled, we are to understand the thing referred to as a prediction of the event in which it is fulfilled. This is an entirely unwarranted assumption. It is just this that has led to a great deal of literalizing in Old Testament prophecy that we might well have been spared. It has been assumed that *πληρωω* in the New Testament had this fixed meaning, while a very little linguistic study shows that it has not.

Indeed, there are cases where the idea is excluded. Take, for example, Luke xxii., 37. Jesus is represented as affirming, *το γεγραμμενον δει τελεσθηναι εν εμοι*. Now this is very different from saying *το γεγραμμενον περι εμου*. Christ could thus say in general cases, as he does, "this saying is fulfilled in me," referring to an Old Testament passage which had nothing to do with him, but which, embodying some universally applicable truth or principle, is applicable to him. It is evident that the Gospel writers did not make such a distinction. And it has been the failure to make it that has led to a great deal of the unnecessary, unreal, encumbering typology and literalistic interpretation which has served no good purpose. Later interpreters, following the example of the Evangelists, who in turn were influenced by the Rabbinical methods of their times, have taken some word which Jesus has

applied in some such natural way, and then have read back, into the Old Testament passage cited, a definite prediction.

One instance deserves notice. In the classic passage, Matthew v., 17, Jesus says, “I came not to destroy but to fulfil ( $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$ ).” He then adds: “Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished (or fulfilled) ( $\varepsilon\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\ \pi\alpha\tau\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\pi\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ ).” The general sense would lead us to expect the verb  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\omega$  in this last clause. Our old English version translated it as if it were, “fulfilled.” This is undoubtedly the sense and the verb  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\omega$  would fit the meaning better. For it is evident that Jesus meant the same thing in this verse that he did in the preceding. Perhaps the most probable explanation is that the writer of the first Gospel, as he does in other cases, tried to soften Jesus’ statement in reference to the law. In any event this indicates how little reliance we can place on these terms with regard to exactness.

### *Conclusion*

In conclusion it is to be noted that there are not nearly so many prophetic citations by Jesus as a casual reading of the Gospels would suggest. We can form no absolute rule as to source; although a large proportion are based on the Septuagint, probably none are directly from the Hebrew, and some are evidently Aramaic renderings. We see great freedom in abridging, condensing, expanding, and combining. Several give evidence of being quotations from memory. We see the influence of Rabbinical exegesis where there is

a tendency to represent Jesus as making a more direct citation than he did. This is always in the interest of the Messianic idea as testified to by the prophets. We discover no formula of quotation to indicate whether the prophecy cited is a direct prediction or for illustration only.

It is significant that, while we do find indications of the throwing in of words, of turns given in order to bring out the conception of the writer, we note the absence of such to a very important degree. Nothing like intentional falsification appears in the treatment of the text. The work of the writers of the Gospels was faithfully and truthfully done, but yet in accordance with the somewhat careless and unguarded literary methods of their time. It is to be noted that while Matthew certainly does have a distinct theory which influenced him in his writing, the fact that we have only one quotation which is peculiar to his Gospel indicates his faithfulness in presenting the words of Jesus in this respect. In every case, by a comparison of the Gospels, we are enabled to get a clear view of Jesus' purpose and method in the citation and application of prophecy. While it cannot be said that we have an actual photograph in each case, we do get a true picture of the scene. Or, to put it differently, we may say that with regard to the use of prophecy by Christ in general, we get photographs, taken from different angles with differences of immediate setting.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE USE OF PROPHETIC PHRASES, TERMS, FIGURES, AND LANGUAGE BY JESUS

#### *In General*

IN addition to his explicit quotations from the Prophets, we find in the sayings and teachings of Jesus a certain historical and literary dependence on prophetic events and sayings; often indicating that the Scripture language or event suggested to him the form of his teaching, the language in which it is expressed, or, in some cases, the truth itself. We shall suggest some of these which are taken from the Gospels at random.

The saying in Matthew vii., 21, 22, "not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, etc," reminds us of Hosea viii., 2, "My God, we Israel know Thee." In Matthew x., 6, "Go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel," we have an analogy as far as the language is concerned to such phrases as in Psalm cxix., 176, "I have gone astray like a lost sheep"; Isaiah liii., 6, "All we like sheep have gone astray"; and Jeremiah 1., 6, "My people hath been lost sheep." In Matthew x., 8, Jesus' injunction to the disciples to "Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers," we have striking prophetic language. The injunction in Matthew x., 28, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear

him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," is like Isaiah viii., 12, 13, "Neither fear ye their fear, nor be in dread thereof. Jahwe of Hosts, him shall ye sanctify, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread."

We have already discussed the relation between Matthew x., 36 *ff.*, and parallels, and Micah vii., 6, "And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." The saying in Matthew xi., 5, "The poor have good tidings preached to them," is a reminiscence of Isaiah lxi., 1, from which chapter Jesus elsewhere quotes verbally. We have a historical reference in Matthew xii., 41, to the preaching of the prophet Jonah. References to the "sower" as in Matthew xiii., 3 *ff.*, remind us of such figures as in Isaiah lv., 10, and Amos ix., 13. The statement of Matthew xiii., 20, in the same connection, reminds us of such sayings of the prophets as Isaiah lviii., 2, and Ezekiel xxxiii., 31, 32, the likeness being that of the truth uttered. The rhetoric of Matthew xiii., 43, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," has sufficient likeness to be regarded almost as a quotation from Daniel xii., 3, "And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

Jesus' use of the proverb regarding the rejection of a prophet by his own people may have been suggested by the like experience of his great predecessor, Jeremiah (Jeremiah xi., 21). The reference to the Pharisees as "blind guides," in Matthew xv., 14, is similar to the descriptions in Isaiah lvi., 10, and Malachi ii., 8, given under like circumstances. The figure of the "plant" in Matthew xv., 13, is similarly used in Isaiah lx., 21,

and 1xi., 3. Such apocalyptic expressions as in Matthew xvi., 27, "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds," are evidently taken from Daniel (see Daniel vii., 10 and 13). These we shall discuss more fully later.

Similar to Matthew xix., 5, are the prophetic words in Malachi ii., 15, concerning the sacredness of the marriage relation. "With God all things are possible," in Matthew xix., 26, reminds us of Jeremiah xxxii., 17, "There is nothing too hard for Thee," and the saying in Jeremiah xxxii., 27, "I am the Lord, the God of all flesh; is there anything too hard for me?" The figure of the "cup" in Matthew xx., 22, is found in Isaiah li., 22, "The bowl of the cup of my fury." The description of his own work as that of service and his life as a ransom in Matthew xx., 28, is like the picture of the suffering servant of Isaiah liii., 10-12. This term "ransom" is significantly used in Psalm xlix., 7. In Matthew xxi., 16, Jesus quotes Psalm viii., 2, "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise," to silence his captious critics. The figure of the "mountain" in Matthew xxi., 21, is used in Psalm xlvi., 2. The saying in Matthew xxiii., 12, "Whoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whoever shall humble himself shall be exalted," is a teaching of God's reversal of the human judgment, like that found in such words of prophecy as Ezekiel xxi., 26, "Exalt that which is low and abase that which is high." The expression, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate," Matthew xxiii., 38, sounds like Isaiah Ixiv., 11, Jeremiah xii., 7, and especially Jeremiah xxii., 5, "This house shall become a desolation," uttered under circumstances not unsimilar.

Jesus uses fitting scriptural language in Matthew xxiii., 39, where he cites Psalm cxviii., 26, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." In Matthew xxv., 32, we have a prophetic description of the judgment of "all the nations" reminding us of the phrase in Joel iii., 12. In the same passage the figure of the sheep and goats may have been suggested by Ezekiel xxxiv., 17, "I judge between cattle and cattle, as well the rams as the he-goats." We have a similar comparison with he-goats in Zechariah x., 3. The phrase "blood of the covenant" in Matthew xxvi., 28, is also found in Zechariah ix., 11. Jesus' reference to his generation as "sinful and adulterous," as in Mark viii., 38, has the genuine prophetic ring. (Compare Isaiah lvii., 3.) Such terms as "sheep" and "little ones," as applied to his own (compare Mark ix., 42), are similar to those used in the prophets, as in Zechariah xiii., 7. Luke vi., 38, regarding the recompense from generous giving, contains a figure found in Isaiah lxv., 6, 7, Jeremiah xxxii., 18, and Psalm lxxix., 12. His comparison of the hearer who "does not" to the falling house in Luke vi., 49, is similar to Ezekiel xiii., 10-16. The use of the verb "to stumble," as in Luke vii., 23, and in many other passages, is the same as that in such passages as Isaiah viii., 14, 15. It is quite likely that the expression, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven," in Luke x., 18, may be a reminiscence of a similar expression by Isaiah (xiv., 12) in his parable against the King of Babylon, "How art thou fallen from heaven." The exhortation, "Rejoice that your names are written in heaven," resembles such passages as Psalm lxix., 28, Ezekiel xiii., 9, and especially Daniel xii., 1, which speaks of "every one that shall be found written in the book."

In the Lord's Prayer the phrase, "Hallowed be Thy name," is a prophetic one. (See Isaiah xxix., 23.) The teaching of Jesus that earnest desire is the requirement for the heavenly Father's gift (Luke xi., 9) is genuinely prophetic, as in Isaiah lv., 6, and especially Jeremiah xxix., 13, "And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart." In Luke xi., 47 *ff.*, he makes an historical reference to the treatment of the prophets. The designation of his disciples as "little flock," in Luke xii., 32, is a phrase found in such passages as Isaiah xl., 11. The injunction, "Fear not," in Luke xii., 32, is a frequent term of encouragement in the prophets, as in Isaiah xli., 14, and xliv., 2.

In Luke xiii., 6, we have another parable of a fig-tree not unlike the prophetic parable of the vineyard in Isaiah v., 2 *ff.* The comparison of the Kingdom of Heaven to "a great supper" in Luke xiv., 16, is like Isaiah's representation of Jahwe's great feast (xxv., 6). In Luke xv., 4 *ff.*, we have another representation of the lost as "sheep" similar to Ezekiel xxxiv., 1-16, and Isaiah xl., 11. Jesus' descriptions of the sufferings of the lost are frequently put in vivid language which reminds us of that of the prophets. (Compare Luke xvi., 24, and like passages, with Zechariah xiv., 12, and Isaiah lxvi., 24.) The representation of God as the avenger of his elect is prophetic. (Compare Luke xviii., 7, and Isaiah lxiii., 4.) Notice the similarity of language between Habakkuk ii., 11, "For the stone shall cry out of the wall," and Luke xix., 40, "The stones will cry out." The description of the coming destruction of Jerusalem in Luke xix., 43, is given in prophetic language similar to Isaiah xxix., 3, and is especially like the descriptions in Daniel xi., 15,

Jeremiah vi., 6, Ezekiel iv., 2, and xxvi., 8, so like as to indicate that his is a reminiscence of the prophetic picture of the downfall of this same city. In Luke xix., 44, we have similar phraseology to Hosea xiii., 16, Psalm cxxxvii., 9, and Nahum iii., 10, indicating direct dependence again.

The saying in Luke xxi., 33, "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away," contains a teaching regarding the unchangeableness and the enduring quality of truth which is couched in similar language in Psalm cii., 26, Isaiah li., 6, and especially in Psalm cxix., 89, and Isaiah xl., 8, thus: "Forever, O Jahwe, Thy word is settled in heaven"; "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand forever." The term "to sift," as used by Jesus in Luke xxii., 31, was used by the greatest of prophets, John the Baptist, in his description of the coming Messiah, and was a familiar prophetic term used in Amos ix., 9. (*See also* Job i., 6-12, and ii., 1-6, where Satan's office is similarly presented.) In Luke xxiii., 30, "Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us," we have freely quoted from memory the words of Hosea x., 8, "And they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and to the hills, Fall on us." Jesus' description of the Judgment as a day of distress and his comparisons of it are not unlike the prophetic comparisons of it to the winnowing of chaff on the threshing-floor. For the former see Jeremiah xxx., 6, where the "day of the Lord" is similarly figured. For the latter see Habakkuk iii., 12, Isaiah xxv., 10, Daniel ii., 35, Hosea xiii., 3.

*In the Fourth Gospel*

The fourth Gospel is so cast in the writer's own form that we have not so much the sayings of Jesus as his teachings developed from them. The language is partly that of Jesus and partly that of the writer. Hence we cannot trace the prophetic thought and language back to Jesus with so much confidence as in the Synoptists. But it will be worth while to notice some of the correspondences. Jesus' characterization of Nathaniel as "an Israelite in whom there is no guile" (i., 47) is like the Psalmist's description of the man "in whose spirit there is no guile" (Psalm xxxii., 2). In John i., 51, the phrase "the heaven opened" is one used by the prophets in describing their visions, as in Ezekiel i., 1, where the same words occur. The expression "living water" in John iv., 10, is similarly used in Jeremiah ii., 13, xvii., 13, and Zechariah xiv., 8, and these may have suggested it. On this phrase compare also John iv., 14, with Isaiah xlix., 10. The universalism, spiritual character of worship, expressed in John iv., 21, are similarly expressed in such passages as Zephaniah ii., 11. In John iv., 36, we have the figure of the sower and reaper so often used in the prophetic writings. (See Amos ix., 13.) The saying concerning the resurrection in v., 29, employs the language of Daniel xii., 2, "Some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." A comparison of John vi., 27, with Isaiah lv., 2, shows a similar teaching regarding the transient and eternal good presented in a similar figure.

In John vii., 24, the injunction regarding righteous judgment is in similar language to Isaiah xi., 3, 4, "He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, etc." In John vii., 37 *ff.*, we have figures comparing salvation

to water, borrowed from such passages as Isaiah 1v., 1, and xii., 3. On Jesus' characterization of himself in this Gospel as "the light of the world," compare Psalm xxxvi., 9, "In thy light shall we see light"; Isaiah xlii., 6, xl ix., 6, and Malachi iv., 2. The phrase, "ye shall die in your sins," in viii., 21, is used in Ezekiel iii., 18, and xxxiii., 8, "The wicked man shall die in his sin." In John x., 11-17, we have striking prophetic language. We have the "good shepherd" and "the sheep" of Isaiah xl., 11, Ezekiel xxxiv., 12, xxxiv., 23, and xxxvii., 24. The "hiring" of verse 12 reminds us of Ezekiel xxxiv., 2-6, Zechariah xiii., 7, xi., 17, and Jeremiah xxiii., 1-3. In verse 16, "other sheep I have which are not of this fold," recalls Isaiah lvi., 8, "yet will I gather others to him, to his gathered ones," and more especially of Ezekiel xxxiv., 11-13. In the same verse, "one flock, one shepherd," may be a reminiscence of the "one shepherd" of Ezekiel xxxiv., 23, and xxxvii., 24. The figures of light and darkness in John xii., 35, are not unlike Jeremiah xiii., 16, and Isaiah ix., 2. In John xv., 1 *ff.*, we have the vine, with God as the husbandman, as in the parable of the vineyard contained in the fifth chapter of Isaiah. The "true vine" of xv., 1, is used in Jeremiah ii., 21. John xv., 6, sounds like Ezekiel xv., 1 *ff.*, and verse 8 like Isaiah lxi., 3. How like Psalm cxix., 160, "The sum of thy word is truth," is John xvii., 17, "Thy word is truth"?

Suggestions of this kind might be carried on indefinitely. They indicate a thorough knowledge of the prophetic writings on the part of our Lord, a knowledge so intimate that reminiscences out of these books suggest statements of truth and forms of language to Jesus in a very natural and spontaneous way.

*Some Special Passages*

We have in the Beatitudes (Matthew v., 3-10 or 12, and Luke vi., 20-23), a striking use of prophetic language. While they show no literal dependence and the citations are free adoptions of the prophetic language, in some instances they are nearly exact references.

Matthew v., 3: "Blessed are the poor in spirit."

Luke vi., 20: "Blessed are ye poor."

Toy considers these as "a summing up" of various passages such as the following:

Isaiah xxix., 19: "The meek also shall increase their joy in Jahwe, and the poor among men shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel."

Isaiah lxi., 1: "Jahwe hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek."

Isaiah lxvi., 2: ". . . but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit."

Psalm lxix., 32 (33): "The meek have seen it and are glad."

To these, suggested by Toy, we would add Psalm xxxiv., 2, Isaiah xiv., 32, Zephaniah iii., 12, and Isaiah lvii., 15.

Matthew v., 4: "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted."

Luke vi., 21: "Blessed are ye that weep now, for ye shall laugh."

In Isaiah lxi., 2, a part of the prophetic mission which Jesus makes his own in the sermon at Nazareth is "to comfort all mourners." Matthew, who follows the Septuagint here, is probably the preferred reading. We may also compare this Beatitude with Psalm cxxvi., 5, "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy," and verse 6.

Matthew v., 5: "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth."

This is almost verbal from Psalm xxxvii., 11.

Matthew v., 6: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled."

Luke vi., 21: "Blessed are ye that hunger now; for ye shall be filled."

This at once reminds us of the Gospel proclamation in Isaiah lv., 1*ff.*: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. . . ." The prophets are replete with promises similarly couched.

Matthew v., 7: "Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy."

In Psalm xviii., 26 (25), we have, "With the merciful thou wilt show thyself merciful." In Proverbs xi., 17, "The merciful man doeth good to his own soul." Matthew has for "merciful," *ελεημονες*, agreeing with the Septuagint of Proverbs xi., 17, which has *ελεημων*. Compare also Proverbs xix., 17, containing the same thought.

Matthew v., 8: "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."

In Psalm xxiv., 3-5, we have a like thought: "Who shall ascend into the hill of Jahwe? and who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; . . ." The Septuagint of Psalm xxiv., 4, has *καθαρος τη καρδια*. Matthew has the same in the plural, *καθαροι τη καρδια*.

Compare further with Psalm li., 12 (10), and xv., 2.

Matthew v., 9: "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God."

Perhaps the nearest verbal reference is Proverbs xii., 20: "To the counsellors of peace is joy." Compare also Isaiah xxxii., 17, and lii., 7.

Matthew v., 10: "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

Luke vi., 22, renders this more freely.

In Daniel vii., 25-27, we have the picture of the saints of the Most High, who have endured persecution, receiving the "kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven."

With regard to the Beatitudes as a whole, it is probable that while Luke has in some respects the more original form, and that the words "in spirit" in Matthew v., 3, and "after righteousness," in Matthew v., 6, are explanatory additions of the writer of the first Gospel, the application in Luke to temporal needs and sufferings is a part of the Ebionitism of the third Gospel. There is probability that they are expanded in the first Gospel, making ten to correspond with the Decalogue. The first Gospel is probably right in preserving the spiritual sense in which Christ undoubtedly used the words. Matthew v., 4, is altogether preferable to Luke vi., 21. We have here a selection by Jesus of Scriptural language and thought which was entirely in keeping with his own spirit and teachings. These passages from Isaiah, as the prophet himself spoke them, while phrased in language applying to temporal needs, are yet ethico-religious in content. In Matthew v., 4, Jesus, however, rises to a spiritual height

above the prophet. Matthew v., 5, is of higher spiritual significance than the Psalm quoted, which had a temporal and historical sense. Jesus' meaning is that the meek are the "heirs of the spiritual privileges of God's kingdom." The promise of Matthew v., 8, that the pure in heart shall "see God" is far more forceful and significant than the words of the Psalmist. While we have here the use of scriptural terms and teachings by Jesus, they gain for him a transformed meaning and he puts a more spiritual content into them.

*The Cry on the Cross.*

In the crucifixion scene Matthew and Mark represent Jesus as uttering a cry of suffering in the words of Psalm xxii., 2 (1).

Psalm xxii., 2—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Matthew xxvii., 46—Identical with the Hebrew.

Mark xv., 34—Identical with the Hebrew.

The texts have several variant readings in Matthew. In Mark there are also a considerable number of variants in the different texts. The words are transliterated from Aramaic versions. In rendering the Greek, Matthew and Mark correspond fairly to the Septuagint.

Various writers have as variously treated this passage. On the one hand, it has been excluded as the interpolation of a Gospel writer in the interest of literal fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy; on the other, it has been interpreted as of great significance, by an opposite school, that seeks to find this very sort of use of prophecy in Jesus himself.

There is, to be sure, no doubt that the accounts of the close of Jesus' life, his passion, and resurrection, have been legendarily embellished. It is probable that the descriptions of natural phenomena, the opening of

the tomb, the darkness over the land, are such embellishments. There is a great deal of symbolism in all these accounts, and they are no doubt magnified. Just as true is it that these writers are interested to adapt these significant incidents in the life of Jesus to prophecy. The later writers found these adaptations very largely in the Book of Psalms. This Psalm in particular was used as containing definite and detailed predictions, especially describing the crucifixion, the piercing of the hands and feet, and the parting of the garments by lot. While, of course, we might class the passage we are discussing under this head, we may just as well say that it was Christ's own use of it which suggested its further use to the apostolic writers.

As a matter of fact we have found in our discussion that perversions of Jesus' actual, definite sayings occur rarely, if at all. We have here, moreover, an instance where the probabilities seem to be against the disposition of this as an arbitrary insertion of the Evangelists. It is hardly such a citation as they would select. It was a cry which would seem to warrant the taunt it elicited, "Let him deliver him, if he love him." It is certain that this difficulty was appreciated, and that it was considered an offence to utter such a cry, admitting desertion by God; for, in the Gospel of Peter, *ελι* is rendered *η δυναμις μου*, as if from a similar Hebrew word meaning "strength." Possibly this difficulty accounts for the omission in Luke.

Another objection raised against its genuineness is that in an hour of distress Jesus would not have been in condition to remember an Old Testament passage. This objection is groundless when we consider the naturalness and spontaneity of Old Testament language on his lips. He probably did not think of this special Psalm

at the moment. While thus, however, we do not deem the reasons urged against its genuineness as sufficient for its rejection, we must at the same time exclude that unnatural and forced interpretation which gives it significance as a cry selected by Christ on account of its Messianic meaning. Tholuck holds that in this cry Christ makes a typical reference, attributes to Christ a recognition of the Psalm as typifying him, and thinks he definitely chose these words because of such a typical Messianic reference. He says, "With the recollection of these words, a consciousness of their typical character had been present at the same time." But in addition to the fact that this would be a use of prophecy which we do not find to be characteristic of Christ, it is not to be supposed that if it were, Jesus would in this hour of supreme agony be concerned as to the choice of a cry which would be a proof of his Messiahship as predicted in the Old Testament. This is an arbitrary and forced interpretation as unnatural as it is unnecessary.

That Jesus uttered a cry of suffering is recorded in all three Gospels. Matthew and Mark agree that he used the language of this Psalm. Luke (xxiii., 46), corresponding to a second cry represented by Matthew and Mark, records that he "cried with a loud voice," and that he uttered scriptural words of a different character, cited from Psalm xxxi., 5: "Into thy hand I commend my spirit." While such a sentiment, expressed in the scriptural language, might well have been uttered by Christ, it is possible that Luke substitutes it for the other, on account of the difficulty we have alluded to, in attributing the latter to Jesus.

The words uttered by Jesus, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," were a human and natural

cry of suffering. Probably not altogether of physical suffering—although we are not to forget that Jesus was a man, with human susceptibilities, and that physical suffering was combined with the suffering of rejection by those whom he loved and would have saved. We need not regard this as the despairing cry of one who had lost hope. God is still “his” God. This cry was in keeping with the scene in the Garden, where he prayed that, if possible, the cup might pass from him. The realm of Old Testament language being one in which he moved, it was most natural that his prayer for strength should be scripturally phrased. His prayer in Gethsemane was so worded. His was the feeling of the great reformer who, as he stood in view of the rule of unrighteousness in a world of slavery, cried in the words of the Psalmist, “How long, O Lord, how long.” (Psalm vi., 3.) Jesus’ words, then, are not to be taken as the despairing cry of a lost cause, still less as a detailed selection in proof of his Messiahship, but in the light of a prayer to his heavenly Father for His presence in an hour of need, naturally uttered in scriptural language.

#### *Jesus’ Use of the Book of Daniel*

Jesus shows a remarkable familiarity with the Book of Daniel. This Book, recalling the last great heroic period of Jewish history, was doubtless one widely used in Jesus’ time. Of course it needs to be remembered that the language which Jesus uses might indicate, not entirely a reliance on Daniel, but may be due to the Apocalyptic style of his time. And yet his dependence on this Book seems certain.

We have already spoken of the use of the figurative language of Daniel iv., 12, in Mark iv., 32, and parallels,

and the possible reference to Daniel ii., 34, 35, and ii., 44, 45, in Luke xx., 18. We saw several instances where there was possible dependence on the language of Daniel. In Luke, x., 20, there is a like figure to that in Daniel xii., 1. In John v., 29, we have the language of Daniel xii., 2; in Luke xix., 43, similarity to Daniel xi., 15; and in Matthew xiii., 43, what is practically a quotation from Daniel xii., 3. Jesus frequently refers to the way in which Israel had treated the prophets, just as Daniel does in his prayer, Daniel ix., 6. Other instances of this kind might be noted. But in all these cases the use is merely that of language. The chief use of the language of this Book is found in the so-called Apocalyptic discourses of Jesus, and it will be of interest to see just how Jesus uses the words of the "prophet" Daniel in these discourses.

### *The Apocalyptic Discourses*

In the discourses contained in Matthew xxiv., Mark xiii., and Luke xvii. and xxi., there are a large number of scriptural references, freely cited in the main. Among the nearest to a direct and verbal citation is that in Matthew xxiv., 15, in Mark xiii., 14, and in Luke xxi., 20, from Daniel ix., 27, xi., 31, xii., 11

Hebrew—Daniel, ix., 27: "and upon the wing of abominations shall come the desolator."

Septuagint—"and upon the temple shall be the abomination of desolations."

Mark xiii., 14—"But when ye see the abomination of desolation . . ."

Matthew xxiv., 15—Identical with Mark.

Luke does not contain this citation, but has "and when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

The words "spoken of by Daniel the prophet" are very likely an insertion by the writer of the first Gospel, in accordance with his custom of supplementing Jesus' words, for re-enforcement and explanation, by connecting them directly with the Old Testament. Influenced by the Septuagint, he also refers it definitely to the "Holy Place," while Mark has "where it ought not." In view of the variance in all three Gospels, it is impossible to determine the original form. The writer of the first Gospel evidently misunderstood the prediction of Jesus. In Mark xiii., 14, and Luke xxi., 7, it is referred to the destruction of the temple. Matthew, however, adds and substitutes in xxiv., 3, "of thy coming and of the end of the world," thus converting the request into one for information concerning the Messianic coming, the end of the age, and concerning the age to come. This explains this evident reference to the event as a "fulfilment" of the words in Daniel. Luke's account is late, written probably after the event. The form of the quotation is doubtless best preserved in Mark. The phrase, "let him that readeth understand," is evidently an insertion. This is a clear example of the way in which the writers inserted comments into Jesus' discourses, in such a manner as to make them appear to later readers as a part of Jesus' words.

Thus the phrase quoted by Christ is not a formal citation of Daniel, but merely a borrowing of the prophetic language and imagery, suggested by the similarity of occasion. The description in Daniel is that of the destruction of the temple in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Jesus is here foretelling the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem. His clear eye saw the "signs of the times." He foresaw what the Roman fortress side by side with the temple signified; and he

also foresaw that the coming event would be of great significance in the propagation of his Gospel. It is as if he would say, "When ye see Jerusalem as in the days of the Syrian invasion, know then that the events of which I speak are at hand."

In Mark xiii., 19, Matthew xxiv., 21 (Luke xxi., 22) we have a similar instance of the borrowing of language from Daniel xii., 1.

Daniel xii., 1: ". . . there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time."

Mark xiii., 19: "For those days shall be tribulation such as there hath not been the like from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never shall be."

Matthew xxiv., 21: ". . . for then shall be great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, nor ever shall be."

Luke xxi., 22: "For these are days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled."

Luke xxi., 22, can hardly refer to a fulfilment of the prophecy of Daniel, for Luke does not seem to quote or refer to the Daniel passage. It probably refers to a general fulfilment of the Old Testament, which contains an abundance of such passages.<sup>1</sup> In these cases we have again a mere borrowing of scriptural phraseology.

In Mark xiii., 24, Matthew xxiv., 29, Luke xxi., 26, in the prediction describing the coming events under the figures of the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, and the shaking of the powers of

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Septuagint of Deut. xxxii., 35, Hosea ix., 7, and Jeremiah v., 29. See Jeremiah 1., 31 (Heb.), xxvii., 31 (Sept.). See also Leviticus xxvi., 31-33, Deut. xxviii., 49-57, Micah iii., 12, Zechariah xi., 6, and Daniel ix., 26, 27.

heaven, we have the use of imagery borrowed from such passages as Daniel viii., 10, Joel ii., 10, iii., 15, 16, Isaiah xiii., 10, xxiv., 23, xxxiv., 4, Ezekiel xxxii., 7, Amos v., 20, viii., 9, Zephaniah i., 15, and Haggai ii., 6-23. In Mark xiii., 26, Matthew xxiv., 30, Luke xxi., 27, and also Mark xiv., 62, Matthew xxvi., 64, Luke xxii., 69, describing the coming of the Son of Man in his glory, we have the use of apocalyptic imagery from Daniel vii., 13, "Behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man."<sup>1</sup>

The questions which concern us here are: 1. Are these genuine utterances of Christ, in whole or in part? 2. If so, to what do they refer? 3. What is the nature of their relation to the Old Testament passages?

The fact that they are in part utterances of Jesus seems sufficiently attested by the fact that the first and third Evangelists agree in ascribing to Jesus a prediction of the last things which were to precede the coming of the Son of Man, and that these were given with some detail. That we can form any precise estimate as to their form or any certain conclusion as to their definite meaning is improbable. The accounts do not entirely agree as to setting, nor in the rendering of the sections of the discourse. All three agree, however, in connecting it with the conversation concerning the temple. And they do agree in the main picture, which represents Jesus as predicting a great catastrophe,

<sup>1</sup> For other points of connection between these chapters and the Old Testament compare:

Matthew xxiv., 7, Mark xiii., 8, Luke xxi., 10, with Isaiah xix., 2.

Matthew xxiv., 10, with the Septuagint of Daniel xi., 41.

Matthew xxiv., 31, with Isaiah xxvii., 13.

Mark xiii., 12, with Micah vii., 6.

Luke xxi., 24, with Zechariah xii., 3, and Isaiah lxiii., 18.

which actually occurred. It seems probable that we have collected here a series of fragments combined probably with some unguine material.

To what did Jesus' prediction relate? If these sections are to be interpreted as a prediction of the final judgment and of his immediate second coming, after the historical catastrophe which he predicts, then we must exclude them as absolutely incongruous with the teaching of Christ that the Kingdom of God is within men; that it was to come without observation; that it was to be "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Even in one of these sections we have the statement in Matthew xxiv., 14, that "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations," before the end should come. Jesus had taught all along the theory of a gradual development. And we cannot believe that at the time of these discourses he completely reversed his whole former teaching. Hence if we must see here (1) a prediction of the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem, and (2), co-ordinate with this, a cataclysmal representation of his immediate Messianic second coming, in person; we shall be obliged to attribute it to some one else than to Jesus, and incline towards that view which conceives of this as a compilation of some sayings of Jesus with some Apocalypse current at the time of the writing of the Gospels, into whose mould the sayings were cast. The latter is the view of many scholars. But such a view has what seems to us the insuperable difficulty of accounting for all such similar passages, found in other connections, as Luke xi., 49-53, xiii., 35, xvii., 23, xvii., 37, xix., 43, 44, Matthew x., 23, 25-31 *ff.*, and xxvi., 64.

Our conclusion is a mediating one. Doubtless we

have here not a single discourse of Jesus, verbally reported, but a compilation. We see no reason to doubt that Jesus would use such imagery as is here borrowed from Daniel. The picture he has in view of the coming destruction of Jerusalem may naturally have recalled to him the similar destruction predicted in Daniel, and thus suggested the language of the prophet. It is not unnatural that Jesus should describe so portentous an event with such vivid language. But this does not mean necessarily that he would do it in the same eschatological sense as did the Apocalypticists of his time. Indeed, he radically departed from that view of the all-evil of the present and the only-good of the future age which was their conception. His voice is one of hope and courage for this life. The Kingdom of God was within men. It was now, and not only to come. With regard to the future, Jesus did not know the day and the hour of the judgment. Only God, he said, knew that.

But that Jesus foresaw that with the coming destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple would come also the opportunity for the spread of his Gospel is altogether probable. Thus, the vivid picture of the coming of the Son of Man means *the coming of the Kingdom of his truth into the great world which lay outside of its present narrow circle*. He likens the great political disturbances which he foresees to the warring of the elements as figuratively set forth in Daniel. He likens the coincident victory of his own truth to the coming of the Son of Man in power and glory. The moral grandeur of the events is fittingly described in these impressive terms. Having pictured, in the language of the prophet, the collapse of the old order in the destruction of the temple, Jesus pictures the coming of the new in

similarly striking terms. And Jesus, thus seeing and predicting, saw with a prophet's eye and spake with a true prophetic voice. His prediction was fulfilled. It all came to pass in "that generation."

The use of this prophetic, or apocalyptic, language by Jesus is not out of harmony with the passages cited. In Daniel, the teaching is of God's triumph in history, and the coming of His Kingdom, His rule, in the earth. The main point of Jesus' teaching is the same, the triumph of truth, his truth, God's truth. We have corroboration for this view in the fact that the writer of the third Gospel evidently interpreted all this as picturing these political events. This interpretation of Jesus' description of the coming of the Son of Man is supported by other similar sayings. In the words of Jesus before the High Priest at his trial we have the same idea when he says, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." (Mark xiv., 62, Matthew xxvi., 64, Luke xxii., 69.) Matthew and Luke have "*Henceforth ye shall see.*"

Notice that Luke has in xxi., 27, corresponding with the other two Gospels, "and then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." Again Jesus adds (xxi., 31), "when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh." Thus the coming of the Son of Man is equivalent to the establishment of the Kingdom of God, a great moral consummation, the victory of truth. The paraphrase given by Professor Stevens<sup>1</sup> is as follows: "You must suffer in my cause; renounce the world; but this you may well do since thereby you will gain my salvation; if you fail, you will be disap-

<sup>1</sup> *The Theology of the New Testament*, page 151.

proved at the Judgment; to such failure you will be tempted by my death and the apparent defeat of my work, but I tell you that some of you will live to see my kingdom triumph.'" Jesus refers to a passage in Daniel which there denotes the establishment of the Kingdom of God and of His saints, in the place of temporal power. He adopts this figurative expression to predict the victory of his truth, the consummation of God's will and kingdom. The same view is expressed in Matthew xvi., 28, "Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here which shall in nowise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."

We are enabled thus to deny those charges of fanatical delusion which represent Jesus as predicting, in these passages, his own personal, immediate coming, a prediction which would stand in contradiction to the whole drift of his teaching. We see, not that Jesus was blinded, but that his disciples misunderstood and misinterpreted his sayings. The apocalyptic language was not unnaturally used by Jesus. In fact, he frequently used Daniel, and borrowed his most frequent designation of himself from this book. Jesus' use of the Old Testament here is like that found elsewhere. We have found him borrowing the striking terms and language of the prophets, and using them to set forth his own teachings, both when the older teaching had spiritual affinity with his own, and when it was found necessary to put into it a higher spiritual content. So here he borrows the sublime apocalyptic language of his time to set forth an equally sublime teaching. Luke x., 18, has a similar use.

Jesus' use of this apocalyptic Book was mainly a borrowing of its striking figures and imagery. Doubtless

he was not uninfluenced by the common use of apocalypse in his time, although he uses it sparingly and not at all in the literally eschatological sense of the apocalypticists of his age. It is difficult to discover any inner connection between the teachings of Daniel and those of our Lord. Indeed he was not in sympathy with the general world-view as contained in this Book.<sup>1</sup> We shall discuss the use of the term Son of Man, which some hold that Jesus obtained from Daniel, a little later on.

While it is not at all unlikely that in some cases, such as we have thus far cited in this chapter, the likeness is merely coincidental; there yet seems to be, in this correspondence of prophetic teaching and prophetic language, a striking evidence of Christ's remarkable familiarity with the Scriptures, and particularly with the prophets. Doubtless many of the terms, phrases, and figures were current in Jesus' time; were a part of its vernacular. But we see that Jesus' use of the prophets was not "that of the scribes." We see nothing of that particularism, that literalism, that pointing to the letter which characterized contemporary Jewish

<sup>1</sup> The reader will do well to consider the interpretations of these discourses in the following works:

Gilbert—*The Revelation of Jesus*, chapter vii.

Stevens—*The Theology of the New Testament*, chapter xii.

Weiffenbach—*Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, pages 135 ff.

Holtzmann—*Neutest. Theologie*, i., 327.

Haupt—*Die eschatalogischen Aussagen Jesu*, pages 21 ff.

Weiss—*Biblical Theology of the New Testament*.

Beyschlag—*New Testament Theology*.

Wendt—*Teaching of Jesus*.

Also an article on "The Apocalyptic Teaching of our Lord," by Rev. H. Kingma, in *The Biblical World*, March, 1897.

teachers. Everything in the Old Testament was not alike to him. He evidently had a predilection for the prophets. Among them he chose largely Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel. This choice, as in the case of his direct citations, was partly on account of the bold and striking language of these prophets, and partly on the basis of spiritual affinity. He moves in the realm of prophetic teaching regarding God, man, and the world. Many of the figures were used doubtless, homiletically, to attract attention. His hearers would be attracted by a striking text, hoping for some new interpretation. While Jesus freely used other portions of Scripture, including the Wisdom Literature and the Law, his use of prophetic language is most frequent. His use of all this striking Old Testament imagery is entirely free and independent of the application of the passage in late Judaism. He rests, not on the Old Testament of his day, but on the Old Testament itself.

### OLD TESTAMENT TERMS

#### *“The Son of Man” and “The Kingdom of God”*

We have already seen that Jesus used with frequency terms which evidently came to him from the prophetic writings. One of these was the term “Son of God,” but its use as a distinct title was seldom if ever adopted by Jesus himself and so we need not discuss it. But, among all these adaptations from Old Testament language and conceptions, we have two especially significant terms. Jesus designates himself as “the Son of Man” and his preaching and teaching is about what he calls “the Kingdom of God.” We shall only discuss these terms sufficiently to get some idea as to how

far he was dependent on the Old Testament ideas involved in these two phrases for his own conception. Various scholars have as variously interpreted the content of these two terms in Jesus' mind. A brief discussion may suffice to indicate whether or not Jesus was dependent on the Old Testament use for the terms, the nature of this dependence, and the amount of freedom and independence in his use of them.

*“The Son of Man”*

Among the many varying views, the following are the main ones:

1. Many scholars hold that the term is derived from Daniel vii., 13, 14, and that Jesus uses it in a Messianic sense. Of those who hold this view some would say that Jesus used it as if its use in Daniel were Messianic. Others hold that Jesus merely borrowed the figure and used it independently of its meaning in Daniel.
2. Some hold that it was used by Jesus, as it is in Daniel, as a symbol of Kingdom and Kingship.
3. Some scholars conclude that he did not derive it especially from Daniel, but rather from its general Old Testament usage, as in the Book of Ezekiel, where it means simply “man.” Of those who hold this view, some think that he meant “The Man, of men,” by exaltation and pre-eminence. Others would put stress on “man” rather than on the article.
4. Lietzmann holds that it could have meant nothing else than “man,” and that the translation should be simply *ανθρωπος* or *ο ανθρωπος*.
5. Still others, admitting that it means only “the man,” would not admit that Jesus merely uses it gen-

erically, but hold that he does use it as a significant self-designation.

The term is found not only in Daniel, but in Ezekiel and in the Psalms:

With regard to its use in the Book of Daniel, Stanton says:

“The vision of ‘One like unto a Son of Man’ in the seventh chapter has been supposed by some even of those who are accustomed to view Messianic prophecy in relation to its historical development, to have referred directly from the first to the Messiah. But it is to be observed, in the first place, that the context supplies an interpretation of the vision, which suggests that for the seer and his contemporaries the vision was an idealized representation of the final bestowal of glory and power on Israel restored and purified, the glorified human form standing for Israel as animal forms stood for the heathen powers.”<sup>1</sup>

It seems quite certain that it was not considered Messianic until Christian times.

It is to be noted that the term *οὐνος τοῦ αὐτοποιοῦντος* does not occur in the Epistles, nor among all the varied designations applied to Christ in the Book of Revelation. In the Synoptists the term occurs thirty times in Matthew, fourteen in Mark, and twenty-five in Luke; in all sixty-nine times. When, however, we remove the duplicates, it occurs only thirty-five separate times. Furthermore, in only eight of these instances is it found in all three Gospels. On four occasions it occurs in Mark and Matthew; one in Mark and Luke; seven in Matthew and Luke; eight only in Matthew, and seven only in Luke. Hence the phrase is not so frequent in Christ’s utterances as it might seem. It is also significant that Jesus alone uses it. The writers

<sup>1</sup> *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, page 109.

themselves never use the term. There can be no doubt that the Evangelists conceived of it in a Messianic sense. It is so used in the fourth Gospel, where it occurs eleven times. In some of the Synoptic passages where it is used, the passages are evidently secondary.

We need to remember that Jesus spoke in Aramaic and that our Greek translation does not give us the exact title as he used it. The Aramaic term would probably be בֶּן נָשָׁא, which it is generally agreed meant "man," or "the man."

It is certain that the Gospel writers, and others in early Christian times, possibly some before Christ, had seen in the "Son of Man" in Daniel, a prediction of the Messiah. But it is just as certain that the early Aramaic expression בֶּן נָשָׁא never developed into a Messianic title, although its later Greek equivalent did.

We have the evidence of the Gospels themselves that the term was not popularly recognized as a Messianic title by the hearers of Jesus. Our Lord himself did not openly use it as a Messianic title. The fact that even his disciples did not so understand it is plainly evident from such a question as this: "Whom say ye that the Son of Man is?" which would have been meaningless if the term involved the declaration of his Messiahship. Looking aside for a moment, from the question as to whether Christ did use it as a definite title or not, there are some places where *uios tou arθρωπou* is used as meaning simply "man." Such an example we have in Mark ii., 28, which has its real significance only when we read "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath, wherefore *man* is lord also of the sabbath." There are some other cases where it appears to mean "man," but in direct reference to himself, as the typical or ideal man.

Removing all these, however, there remain some instances where the title seems to be a special self-designation not referring especially to his humanity. In these cases, the idea of kingship and dominion seems to be back of the conception. But here, as we saw in our discussion of the apocalyptic sections, the sense is not eschatological, but relates to the victory of his truth in the world.

In view of these various uses, we must reject those extreme views which make it simply a synonym for the word "man," in all cases; although as we have seen there are some such cases. We must also reject that view which, based on the vision in Daniel, makes it a significant Messianic designation by Jesus. We deem it probable that Jesus did not derive the title from any special passage in the Old Testament. While, on the one hand, he seems to have used the term in a symbolic sense, somewhat as it is used in Daniel, representing himself as the bearer of the message proclaiming the Kingdom of God; on the other, he also used it as a term signifying his humanity, and his typical humanity, more as it is used in Ezekiel.

The evangelical writers evidently lost view of this ideal sense in which Christ used it, and after his death being convinced that he was the Messiah, they carried out the identification of Messiahship with the term "Son of Man." They did this under the influence of its later Messianic significance as indicated by the Book of Enoch. In this way it became incorporated into the text of the Gospels, in some cases as a title, where Jesus had used *υιος του αρθρωπον* with the simple meaning of "man."

We can see here the free hand of Jesus in his use of this Old Testament term. He is not bound by its use

in the Old Testament. He puts new content into the Old Testament form. The connection of thought with its use in Daniel would be something like this: He, like the man in the vision of the prophet, comes as the bearer of the Kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup>

*“The Kingdom of God”*

We hear much in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels and in the teaching of Jesus, about the

<sup>1</sup> For a more complete discussion of this question the reader is referred to the following works:

H. Lietzmann—*Der Menschensohn*.

J. Estlin Carpenter—*The First Three Gospels*.

Baldensperger—*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, chapter vii.

Grau—*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, chapter vi.

Appel—*Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu: Der Menschensohn*.

Boehmer—*Reich Gottes und Menschensohn im Buche Daniel*.

Krop—*La Pensée de Jésus sur le Royaume de Dieu*, pages 118 ff.

Stalker—*The Christology of Jesus*, chapter ii.

Gilbert—*The Revelation of Jesus*, pages 185 ff.

Wellhausen—*Is. und Jüd. Geschichte*, Note 2d Ed., chapter xxiii, page 346.

N. Schmidt—“Was בָּר נָשָׂא a Messianic Title?” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xv., 1896, parts 1 and 2.

Wendt—*The Teaching of Jesus*, English translation, vol. ii., pages 139 ff.

Beyschlag—*New Testament Theology*, vol. i., pages 60 ff. English translation.

Dalman—*Die Worte Jesu, u. s. w.*, *Der Menschensohn*, chapter ix., pages 191 ff.

Stanton—*The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, pages 239 ff.

Weiss—*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, Sec. 16.

Holtzmann—*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, pages 246–264.

Stevens—*The Theology of the New Testament*, chapter ix.

Noesgen—*Christus der Menschen- und Gottessohn*.

Bruce—*The Kingdom of God*, chapter vii.

Kingdom of God, or, as Matthew has it, the Kingdom of Heaven. This was not a new term. John the Baptist, standing within the portals of Judaism, preached, saying, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Jesus began his preaching with a like call. It is to be noted that the term generally given in Matthew is *βασιλεια των ουρανων*, while elsewhere it is *βασιλεια του θεου*. It is evident that these terms are synonymous. As to which term Jesus used, scholars are divided. It is a question which rests largely on the relative dates of the Gospels.

Another question is whether the term *βασιλεια* is used in the abstract sense, meaning the rule of God; or the concrete, meaning the realm, the sphere of the rule. The word itself may mean either. We have here an Old Testament and Jewish term adopted by Jesus. The question with which we are concerned is, How far, and in what way, was Jesus dependent on its original Old Testament and Jewish content; and how far did he transform, set aside, and develop this?

In the earlier conception, the Kingdom of God was practically synonymous with the Kingdom of Israel. It was something present as well as future. The work of the Prophets was to extend this rule of God. By reason of the nation's loss of independence, and the rise of the great world-kingdoms, the idea was changed and enlarged, but yet without giving up the special kingship of Israel. It was transformed into a hope, a hope of re-establishment. It had two aspects: first, it was a present fact; God was ruler; but second, it was yet to receive its full manifestation and realization. In the later Judaism the idea of the Kingdom as one to come prevailed. It had temporarily been given to others on earth; but God would again reclaim it. Thus

there grew up a distinction between the present and the future kingdoms. The Kingdom to come came to be conceived of as a divine, miraculous event with a fixed, definite time. The idea came to have, on the one hand, an eschatological, transcendental character; and at the same time one that was political and earthly. In late Judaism, it lost much of the spirituality and universalism of the older prophetic conception.

The phrase itself was not common in current usage, and occurred scarcely ever in a Messianic sense. Its use in Jewish literature, in the main, is with the abstract sense, the idea of the rule, kingship, and dominion of God. It is probable that the later Messianic sense of מלכות שמים was secondary to this.

Let us now consider Christ's use of the term. Did he use Matthew's "Kingdom of Heaven," or the term of the other writers, "Kingdom of God"? Some hold that he used both, interchangeably and synonymously. Others that he used both, each involving a different idea. The rendering which Matthew gives is that of the original Hebrew phrase מלכות שמים. It is to be noted that in the Psalms of Solomon, which is the best source for Jewish ideas of the time of Christ, the main thought is that of God as King, a monotheistic confession. While we cannot decide the question, we may say, in any case, that the explanation which attributes to Christ the use of the term "Heaven" because he shared the Jewish prejudice against uttering the divine name, must be rejected. Nor does it seem probable that Jesus would use the two terms with a different content for each. The textual evidence would seem to be in favor of the term "Kingdom of God."

How far did Jesus put the Old Testament and Jewish

content into the term; how far did he go back and put into it the prophetic content; how far did he put into it an original content of his own? It seems probable that he used the term in its abstract sense, signifying the rule of God. In this he seems to be at one with the Old Testament and with Judaism.

Was it something present or future for him? To the Jews of Christ's time the Kingdom meant primarily the Messianic Kingdom, which was something chiefly in the future. Some have held that here Christ was at one with Judaism. They hold that he uses the term mainly in an eschatological sense. The difficulty in regard to such a view is that it involves the exclusion of much that is in the Gospels, an unnatural interpretation of other passages, and a good deal of inference and conjecture. Some writers, while admitting the ethical element in the teaching of Jesus, hold that he centred largely on the eschatological idea. They hold that his teaching concerning the Kingdom of God is in the latter sense. This involves a certain dualism in Christ's teaching which we fail to find.

It seems clear to the present writer that Jesus, in choosing between the two conceptions of Judaism, chose the one less emphasized in Judaism, and that the Kingdom of God, with him, was something here and now, in the world, within men, silently and slowly progressing. He had also, however, the idea of a future revelation and realization, which would be the consummation of the present development and growth of the Kingdom. But he was mainly concerned with the rule of God as something universal and present. The Kingdom is like the mustard seed and leaven; it is the rule of God, quiet and progressive. It is like the seed which grew while the man slept. The

Parable of the Tares is not eschatological in its significance.<sup>1</sup>

The Kingdom or rulership of God appears, in the very nature of things, present. In saying that it was "at hand," Jesus was not altogether at variance with the older use. As we have said the term means in the Old Testament both (1) God's rule, and (2) Israel's rule. With Jesus it meant only the former. It was for him the present reality of God in the world. In making this choice, Jesus sets aside the particularism of the older view, and applies it to the universal life of men. To some extent, this is a return to the prophetic conception. But Jesus goes beyond the prophets. While the prophets called primarily to the nation, and conceived of universal salvation only as coming through Israel, Jesus appeals primarily to the individual, and offers the benefits of the Kingdom to those who have the least national claim. Sonship, citizenship in the Kingdom, does not consist in a choice that has anything to do with national prerogative, but which depends on character and life.

Thus we see that, in some points, Jesus was at one with the Old Testament and Judaism, but that the term gained for him, in general, a transformed meaning. While they regarded it as mainly future, secondarily present, he regarded its present reality as the fundamental thing. He adopts the prevailing Jewish usage of the term as signifying the rule of God, but on different grounds. On the matter of its pre-existence he is at one with Judaism, in conceiving its only pre-existence as in God himself.

<sup>1</sup> On the significance of the parables in this connection, see Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden*.

There is an obvious difference at one special point. With the Jews, and in the Old Testament, it meant the displacing of the worldly kingdoms; Jesus taught that its citizens were to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's. We do not find that Jesus had any community idea, corresponding to the Old Testament idea of its confinement to Israel. Wherever there is any indication of such in Jesus' words, it is merely a description of the condition of things under the rule of God. We have seen that where he makes a direct return to the prophetic ideal, he makes this his starting-point and goes far beyond the prophets. The likeness between the conception of Jesus and that of the Old Testament and Judaism is only at those points where there is ethical and spiritual affinity between the two. His variance is at those points which would preclude the spiritual and ethical character of the Kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in the use of both of these terms, the Son of Man, and the Kingdom of God, we find Jesus dependent on the Old Testament and prophetic conceptions,

<sup>1</sup> With regard to the linguistic use of the term, the reader is especially referred to Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu, u. s. w.* While Dalman, in his literary treatment of the question, is by no means the best authority, his contribution to the linguistic discussion of the question is of great value.

See, also:

Issel—*Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes im N. T.*

Titius—*Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes.*

J. Weiss—*Die Predigt Christi vom Reiche Gottes.*

Stevens—*Theology of the New Testament*, chapter iii.

Beyschlag—*New Testament Theology.*

Wendt—*The Teaching of Jesus.*

Weiss—*Biblical Theology of the N. T.*

Bruce—*The Kingdom of God.*

Boardman—*The Kingdom of God.*

and yet free from their limitations. He here views the prophets with the eye of the spirit, disregarding the local and national form. He borrows the terms, and vitalizes them with his own living truth which he uses them to express.

## CHAPTER V

### SOME ALLUSIONS, BY JESUS, TO THE PROPHETS AND TO PROPHECY

IN a number of instances, we have various allusions by Christ to the prophets and to prophecy, which we shall now discuss, to see what light may come from them as to how Jesus regarded prophecy. In Matthew v., 17, we have the significant words, "Think not that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets; I came not to destroy but to fulfil," and in verse 18, "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass away from the *Law*, till all things be accomplished." In Luke xvi., 16, 17, we have, "The Law and the Prophets were until John; from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the *Law* to fall." Matthew has the first half of this (Luke xvi., 16) differently worded in Matthew xi., 12, 13, in connection with Jesus' eulogy of John the Baptist. Luke's connection is poor, and we should consider Luke xvi., 16, as a parallel to Matthew xi., 12, 13, and Luke xvi., 17, as a parallel to Matthew v., 18.

Of course the significance of these passages depends on the content of the word "fulfil." We have already seen that the meaning of this word cannot be narrowed

down to an accomplishment of detailed prediction. We shall discuss its general use at the close of our entire investigation. In this case, however, it is plainly evident that Jesus could not mean one thing in the case of the Law and another in the case of the Prophets. It is noticeable that Matthew has *εως αν παντα γενηται*. We might naturally expect the verb *πληρωω* here. It may be that Matthew has purposely softened a saying about the Law in particular. In any event the meaning is the same as in verse 17, where *πληρωσαι* is used. Our older English version so translated Matthew v., 18. Though not so exact as that of the Revised Version it gave the sense as well if not better. One thing is conceded everywhere, that is, that Jesus' attitude toward the Old Testament Law was one of conscious freedom and criticism. He did not hesitate to abrogate its letter. He valued it only in proportion as it expressed his own spiritual views. Hence his "fulfilment" of the Law is an essential and not a literal one. No one could be disposed to deny this. This being so, the meaning here would imply a conscious freedom as to the Prophets as well as to the Law. Whatever Jesus meant by fulfilment of prophecy, would apply equally to the Law. What he means is this. While he seems to be abrogating the Law, and sometimes the Prophets, by his radical departures, he is really fulfilling their spirit and ideal. He realized indeed that very often the breaking of the letter was absolutely necessary for the preservation of the spirit. Viewing fulfilment in this light he could go on and say, even of the Law, that not one of the least of its commands could be broken, but that men must do and teach them (Matthew v., 19).

It was in just this sense that Jesus used the term "the Law and the Prophets," in other instances. In

Matthew vii., 12, he cites the Golden Rule as the sum of the Law and the Prophets; again in Matthew xxii., 40, he says that on the love for God and neighbor " hangeth the whole Law and the Prophets." He means here the whole moral drift, the spiritual ideal of the Law and the Prophets. We have the same thought in Matthew xiii., 17, " For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not ; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not." Luke x., 24: " For I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not ; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not." We have a similar passage in John viii., 56, " Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad."

Jesus represents the prophets and righteous men as longing for that coming of the Kingdom of God of which he is the bearer. Luke's setting of the passage, in connection with the mission of the disciples, is the correct one. The Gospel they are to preach has been the great ideal, hope, and longing of the ages past. In John viii., 56, Jesus represents Abraham as the friend and desirer of truth and of the future coming of the Kingdom of God. He rejoiced in the hope which was realized in Jesus Christ. We deem the idea of a seeing, by Abraham, in prophetic hope, more natural to Jesus than that of a paradisaical seeing. Whatever may have been the conception of the writer of the fourth Gospel, with Jesus the idea was that in " his day " was realized Abraham's ideal.

We have a saying of somewhat similar import in John v., 45-47, ". . . there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. For

if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" What Jesus says in substance is this: You profess great faith in Moses, but if you really believed Moses, if you saw the spiritual significance of Moses and his system, you would see in me the realization of the Mosaic hope and ideal. Jesus represents the teaching of Moses as in such spiritual relation to his own work and mission, that a true acceptance of the teaching of Moses, which would involve this spiritual conception of it, would lead them to accept him as the ideal of the Mosaic hope. We have no need to hunt out some particular Messianic passage written by Moses. In verse 47, Jesus speaks of Moses' "*writings*," his writings in general as containing his hope and ideal.

Again in John v., 37-40, "And the Father who sent me, he hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form. And ye have not his word abiding in you; for whom he sent, him ye believe not. Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life." Here Jesus rebukes his hearers with a failure to see the real teaching of the Scriptures which they searched so arduously, and in which they were so concerned about trifles and details, such as Davidic relationship of the Messiah, that they lost the real truth disclosed. They were without that inward spiritual apprehension of the Old Testament truth which would have led them to him. (John xviii., 37.) In saying that the Scriptures bear witness of him, Jesus means, according to the whole context, that the sum and drift of Scripture teaching was such that, if

rightly read, it would lead men to come to him for life. Its ideal was expressed in him.

The whole significance of these passages in the fourth Gospel is not to be found by seeking for some definite, particular text or texts which may be found to have something like literal correspondence to Jesus. Indeed, this is the very "search" which Jesus condemned. The idea of Jesus was that he, in his mission and teaching, was in spiritual sympathy, and inner agreement, with the revelation in the Old Testament.

In the scene of his apprehension by Judas, when one of his followers used violence in defence, according to the first Gospel, Jesus rebukes him and says, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" (Matthew xxvi., 54.) This verse is peculiar to Matthew. Later on, however, we have another, of similar import, which Jesus addresses to his captors. In Matthew xxvi., 56, it reads, "But all this is come to pass, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled." Mark renders it, "but this is done that the scripture might be fulfilled." Luke says nothing of the fulfilment of Scripture. In place of this he has, "but this is your hour, and the power of darkness."

It is very significant that in the parallel account in John (xviii., 1 *ff.*), although it has allusions to scriptural fulfilment made by the writer himself, these passages do not appear, and when Peter smites the servant, Jesus says, in place of Matthew's "How then should the scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be," the very different words, "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?"

The passage Matthew xxvi., 54, is in a section (52-54)

peculiar to Matthew. This passage is another of the first Gospel's frequent editorial insertions. It is a parallel instance to such editorial comments as we have in i., 22, ii., 5, ii., 15, ii., 23, iv., 14, 15, especially xii., 17 *ff.*, xiii., 34, 35, and the expansion in xiii., 14, and xxi., 4, 5. This is a part of the writer's own framework into which his narrative is sometimes adjusted. The record of these last days is full of similar details, as in xxvii., 9, concerning the Messianic price, where the whole significance of the matter rests on a mis-translation with regard to the potter's field. Matthew xxvi., 54, contains the writer's words and not those of Jesus.

With regard to the indefinite Old Testament reference in Mark xiv., 49, and parallels we have singular phenomena. Matthew is evidently following Mark here, but expands considerably, and has the more direct reference to "the prophets," with Isaiah liii. evidently in mind. Luke, on the other hand, who is either following his own independent source, or is supplementing Mark by it, does not have this reference to prophecy, but has instead "this is your hour and the power of darkness." Still more significant is the fact that the parallel account in the fourth Gospel does not have the Old Testament reference. It is to be noted that the detailed character of the record in John, in this instance, gives it the authority of an eye and ear witness. Yet, although he has set this record into a framework of prophetic fulfilment, he does not attribute these words to Jesus. That we have here another editorial insertion, a remark by the writer of the Gospel, has been held by most scholars, from Erasmus down.

In Mark ix., 12, "and how is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at

nought?" we have what appears to be another expansion of a similar character to the last one we considered. The parallel in the first Gospel has simply "even so (like John the Baptist) shall the Son of Man also suffer of them." Luke does not record this particular conversation. The reference in Mark ix., 12, to what is "written" is evidently a later insertion. It must be remembered, in such cases as this, that these incidents as we have them related here were later recollections of the event, and as so conservative a scholar as Edersheim says, "we may, without irreverence, doubt whether on that occasion he (Jesus) had really entered into all those particulars."<sup>1</sup>

In Luke xviii., 31, we read that, a short time before his last visit to Jerusalem, "he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written through the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of Man," and he then goes on to give the details of the treatment he is to receive. Passages of similar import are Matthew xxvi., 24, Mark xiv., 21: "The Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of him," which however Luke (xxii., 22) renders, "as it hath been determined." There are great difficulties in this account in the 18th chapter of Luke. As Edersheim says, the fact that, according to Luke himself, "they understood none of these things, and the saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken," and the surprise which absolutely overcame them, make Edersheim's conclusion probable, that we may doubt whether Jesus entered into particulars and "that the Evangelists report what Jesus had said in the light of after events." In any event, the indefiniteness of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii., page 345.

phrases, "all things written through the prophets," "as it is written of him," "as it hath been determined," could only indicate, what is indeed true, that Jesus did regard his life as under the guidance of a divine decree.

The passages Luke xxiv., 25 *ff.*, and 44 *ff.* undoubtedly belong to a late tradition. The third Gospel was written at a time when legend and tradition had already developed. We see in its expansions at the beginning, in the story of the birth and infancy, and at the end, in the post-resurrection appearances, evidences of this influence. These indefinite allusions are a part of the consciousness of the Church. Whatever value we may give to them, the attestation of detailed historicity is too slight to admit of our using them in a discussion of the actual sayings of Jesus.

### *The Triumphal Entry*

In the account of the Triumphal Entry (Matthew xxi., 1-11, Mark xi., 1-11, Luke xix., 29-44, John xii., 12-19), Jesus is represented as carrying out a programme suggested by Zechariah ix., 9. Mark, the original account, merely states the occurrence. Matthew is at pains to explain it, and adds, "Now this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophet, saying,

Tell ye the Daughter of Zion,  
Behold, thy King cometh unto thee,  
Meek, and riding upon an ass,  
And upon a colt, the foal of an ass."

Mark and Luke, supported by John, mention only one animal, but Matthew, misunderstanding the repetition

in Zechariah, which is merely a poetic repetition, finds need of two animals, and so in his narrative he actually supplies one in order to make the event square with his incorrect reading of the prophecy. The fourth Gospel, like the first, points out the reference to prophecy, but significantly adds, "These things understood not his disciples at the first," and states that all this was an afterthought. It would seem from this that those who beheld the scene were entirely in the dark as to any purpose of Jesus formally to fulfil a prophecy in proof of his Messiahship. And naturally enough, for there is no evidence that this was his purpose.

The historicity of the event is too natural and too well-attested to be called in question. That Jesus' use of the colt and the general manner of his entry into the city had any relation, in his mind, to the prophecy in Zechariah, we are not so certain. The "need" (Matthew xxi., 3) which Jesus had for a colt was just as likely to have been physical as it was that he should make an entry into the city conformable to prophecy. John says that it was not so conceived at the time. And neither Mark nor Luke had arrived at any such understanding.

It is not at all impossible, however, that the Old Testament prophecy may have suggested it. Zechariah ix., 9-12, contains a beautiful picture which the Evangelist has, not altogether unfittingly, applied to Jesus. It presents the coming king of Israel as clothed with humility and peace. To suppose, however, that Jesus' action was grounded merely in a purpose to fulfil a prophecy is unlike anything we have seen in him. Any such charge made against him would weaken the very case of those apologists who seek to find correspondences between prophecy and the events of his life.

For such a use by Jesus would show, not that he was the Messiah, but merely that he was making a Messianic claim. Bruce says, "The symbolical act was of a piece with the use of the title 'Son of Man,' shunning Messianic pretensions, yet making them in a deeper way." If Jesus performed this act with conscious reference to the prophecy in Zechariah it was not as something literal, to be carried out in proof of his Messiahship, but was an acted parable to illustrate the character of his Kingdom as one of humility and peace.

*The Sign of Jonah the Prophet.*

In Matthew xii., 38-42, the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* are represented as saying to Jesus: "Master we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet."

Luke represents the matter somewhat differently. He says (Luke xi., 29-32), "And when the *multitudes* were gathering together unto him, he began to say, This generation is an evil generation: it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah."

We have still another account in Matthew xvi., 1-4, where the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees* ask a sign from heaven. Jesus rebukes their inability to discern the "signs of the times" and adds, "an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah."

Mark viii., 11-12, has a similar instance in which the *Pharisees* try Jesus and seek a sign, and Jesus, deeply moved, replies, "Why doth this generation seek a

sign? Verily I say unto you, *There shall no sign be given unto this generation.*"

A comparison of the two passages in Matthew (xii., 38 *ff.*, and xvi., 1 *ff.*) indicates quite clearly that xii., 38 *ff.* is a doublet. Matthew xvi., 1 *ff.*, and Mark viii., 11, 12, have similar setting for the incident, following the account of the miraculous feeding. Luke (xi., 29 *ff.*) has his own setting. Textually the whole incident is full of difficulties. We note especially one. Mark represents Jesus as answering that "There shall NO SIGN be given unto this generation" (Mark viii., 12). But Matthew and Luke represent Jesus as saying, "and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah" (Matthew xvi., 4, and Luke xi., 29). It seems evident that Jesus did, in some way or other, declare that his sign was that of the prophet Jonah.

Now, as to the interpretation of his words: Matthew, in section xvi., 1 *ff.*, offers none. Luke, however, in the corresponding section, does give one; he adds (xi., 30), "For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation." This might mean most anything, and whether it be a parenthetical insertion by the writer or added words of Jesus makes little difference.

But we have in the doublet, Matthew xii., 38 *ff.*, a very explicit explanation: "for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." There is no doubt but what this is an inserted explanation of a writer or later editor of the first Gospel. We have found already several such. It has against its genuineness:

1. Its general improbability. It is just the kind of sign that Jesus would not give. He had steadily

refused to give miraculous signs. 2. It is unsupported by both Mark and Luke. 3. It is not found in the account in Matthew (xvi., *iff.*) of which this is a mere doublet. 4. It interrupts the natural connection between verses 39 and 41. 5. But more important than all, it is denied by the very context. Verses 41 and 42 give the interpretation of Jesus' words : "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here."

Luke has this same commentary in a slightly transposed order. Jesus, in speaking of the sign of the prophet Jonah, makes no reference to Jonah's experience in the belly of the great fish. According to his own explanation of it, as recorded by both Matthew and Luke, he refers to Jonah's preaching to the Ninevites and their repentance as recorded in Jonah i., 2, and iii., 5. The "sign" Jesus gives them refers to his preaching; it is a preaching of repentance like that of Jonah and indeed of the prophets in general. As Holtzmann remarks, "Allerdings haben auch andere Propheten Busse gepredigt; aber aus ihrer Reihe wird Jonas herausgegriffen, weil die Nineviten Mt. xii., 41, Lc. xi., 32, die beschämende Parallele zu der gegenwärtigen Generation bilden sollen. Wunderbar, wie das Auftreten eines Gottesboten in der heidnischen Stadt war, so wird die Erscheinung des Messias inmitten dieser Generation an sich schon ein *σημεῖον* sein."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Holtzmann, *Handcommentar zum N. T.*

If the allusion had been, as Matthew interprets it, in verse 40, a reference to Jesus' coming death and resurrection, it would have been altogether enigmatical to Jesus' hearers. But his meaning as given in verse 41 is perfectly clear and very forceful. The sign according to Matthew's interpretation in verse 40 would have been just the kind of sign they asked for, that they were always asking for, but that he as steadily refused to give them. He says "no sign (such as this generation asks for) shall be given it; but I will give it a sign, one less pleasing to its mind, the sign of Jonah." Jesus appears among them as a preacher of judgment and repentance, sent from God, just as Jonah, a preacher of judgment, was a sign to the Ninevites. We have a similar case in John vi., 30 *ff.* There the Jews demanded a "sign": "What, then, doest thou for a sign, that we may see, and believe thee? what workest thou?" And again his answer is that he gives no sign but himself. He offers his own person and his work as his only sign.

As Jonah, a preacher of judgment and repentance, was a sign to the Ninevites, which they heeded, and which led them to repentance, so Jesus, a preacher of judgment and repentance, is a sign to this generation. But, to emphasize the virtue of the Ninevites in contrast to his hearers' own wilfulness, he adds that these Gentiles shall even rise up in the judgment and condemn them, "for a greater than Jonah is here." The wickedness of the refusal of this generation to repent is multiplied, for while these ancient Gentiles repented at Jonah's preaching, this generation refused to repent at the preaching of one greater than Jonah.

Still more is involved in this contrast. The "sign" is one which indicates the universality of God's grace.

Even the despised Gentiles are to rise and condemn the elect Israelites in the Judgment. To emphasize this, Jesus adds another instance of the coming of the heathen queen to listen to the words of Solomon, while the "elect" of this generation refused to listen to a greater than Solomon. She, too, a heathen queen, with the heathen Ninevites, shall rise up against the Israel of this generation in judgment. This universality is involved in the "sign" of repentance-preaching. The "sign" to this generation is that the nature of God's message is, Grace through repentance, and not grace by prerogative; and this generation will do well to heed this sign. The substance of Jesus' thought here is not unlike that in the sermon at Nazareth which we discussed in Chapter II.

## CHAPTER VI

### JESUS' VIEW OF PROPHECY; HIS CONCEPTION OF IT; AND HIS RELATION TO IT. HIS IDEA OF FULFILMENT

JESUS was, himself, first of all, a prophet. Prophecy in Israel had been dead for a long time. Israel had again and again sighed for the return of Elijah and the prophets. The new era began with John the Baptist. He was the Elijah for whom Israel had longed, although she knew him not when he came. Our Lord was the "prophet" like unto Moses whom God was to send. (Deuteronomy xviii., 15; Acts iii., 22, and vii., 37). The nearest relation of Jesus to the Old Testament prophets was that of succession. His call to his work was the true prophetic call, his inspiration was the prophetic type of inspiration, taking the latter in its best and highest sense. It is interesting to notice that this prophetic call came to him in genuine prophetic fashion. If one will compare the calls of Samuel, David, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others of the prophets he will see likenesses to that of our Lord. In many cases it consisted of announcement by another and of inward consciousness of the prophetic mission. As Samuel ordained David, as Elijah cast his mantle on Elisha, so Jesus' formal induction to his prophetic office was at the hands of John the Baptist in baptism.

Samuel's call came to him in a dream as he lay down to sleep in the temple of Jahwe; Isaiah's in a marvellous vision in the Holy Place. So to Jesus, as he comes forth from his baptism, the call comes in a vision. As the voice came to Isaiah, bidding him go forth and speak in God's name, so it comes to Jesus: "he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him: and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, on thee hath my choice (my appointment) fallen."<sup>1</sup>

The prophetic inspiration came, as to the prophets of old, through the medium of the Spirit, and in a vision. At the moment of his call, Jesus formally shares the apostolic succession of the prophets of God.

Likewise the opening message of our Lord's ministry was the prophetic message; the call to repentance in view of the nearness of the Kingdom of God. "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe in the Gospel." (Mark i., 15.) He takes up the prophetic message of John the Baptist. As Wellhausen says: "Er trat damit nicht als Messias auf, als Erfüller der Weissagung, sondern als Prophet; seine Botschaft war anfänglich selber Weissagung." (*I. and J. Geschichte*, p. 374.) He took his standing place upon prophetic ground. He refers to himself as a prophet. In Matthew xiii., 57, he applies to himself the proverb, "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and in his own house." His messengers, like himself, are prophets, and are to "rejoice and be exceeding glad" in that persecution which was

<sup>1</sup> Both John and Luke represent this as an objective reality—John explicitly so; Luke puts it in realistic form. But both Matthew and Mark represent it as a vision to Jesus alone, as it undoubtedly was.

his and theirs, "for so persecuted they the prophets," who had gone before. The only sign he will give is the sign of the prophet Jonah, *i. e.*, the preaching of repentance (Luke xi., 29-32). It was necessary that he should go up to the Holy City, "for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (Luke xiii., 33). He predicted that there should come after him those who would subvert his teaching and mislead his followers; whom he designates in contrast to himself, as "false prophets."

In his whole work and teaching, Jesus recognized himself as a prophet and as a successor of the prophets. In several instances, the people around him regard him as a prophet, and do so by his own consent.

In Luke vii., 16, the people say, "a great prophet is arisen among us." That this claim was made for Jesus by his friends is indicated by the retort of his accusers to Nicodemus, "Search, and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (John vii., 52). The later apostles recognized Jesus' character as a prophet. Peter quotes concerning him: "And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people." The woman of Samaria (John iv., 19) and the blind man to the Pharisees declared, "He is a prophet." The multitudes said, "This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee" (Matthew xxi., 11). He goes up to his fate at Jerusalem, and in view of his coming death he mourns over the Holy City, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets."

This aspect of our Lord's work has often escaped attention. It does not seem that, at the first, he had full consciousness of his Messiahship. For several months he pursued his way much as the older prophets had

done. At first he stood side by side with John the Baptist. The exigencies that called forth both John and Jesus offer parallels to the older prophetic activity. It was an anxious, restless time, an age of great political and religious agitation. For two hundred years great emergencies had risen and momentous events had followed in rapid succession. There had been the religious persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, the Maccabean uprising, the establishment of the Hasmonean kingdom, its weakening through embittered party contests, and its downfall at the hands of Rome, the return of foreign lordship, the vain but unceasing attempt to cast off the yoke, and, finally, the oppressive tyranny of the great Herod. The old quiet life, on which the Theocracy was dependent, was gone. Through the Maccabean wars the Jews had been driven out of their beaten path and they had never recovered it. They were engaged in conflict with the Romans and the great question on all thoughtful minds was, What is to be the result? It was just the same question which had pressed itself upon Amos and Jeremiah at the threatened conflict with the Assyrians and Chaldeans. And both John and Jesus answered it just as the two older prophets had done. Jesus saw, in advance, the inevitableness of the destruction of the Theocracy. The prophecy of the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God was inseparable from the prophecy of the immediate destruction of the temple and the Holy City.

In our previous discussion of the apocalyptic discourses of Jesus we saw that he somehow or other identified the destruction of formal Judaism with the spread and victory of his own truth. The Kingdom of God, in the minds of John and Jesus, as it had been in

the minds of the prophets of old, had other foundations than the temple, the Holy City, and the Jewish people. Membership in it is individually conditioned.<sup>1</sup>

This brief survey may serve to indicate what we have affirmed, namely, that Jesus was called forth, like John the Baptist, as a prophet, to do the work of a prophet, to meet an exigency in an age like those to which the Old Testament prophets had been called. They both met the exigency in a genuinely prophetic way. Later on, our Lord discovered that he was a greater than Jonah, that he was more than prophet; that he was priest and king. Or if one prefers to put it differently, later on, he revealed himself as more than a prophet. But at the beginning, whatever he may have felt regarding his own mission, he spoke and taught and was received as a prophet.

Let us proceed to analyze, a little more closely, Jesus' likeness to the prophets of the Old Testament.

A study of the life of Jesus shows his affinity with the prophets in three different respects:

1. His was largely the prophetic type of preaching and teaching.
2. He shared the prophetic lot and fate.
3. His work was like that of the prophets.

#### *1. Points of Contact in His Preaching and Teaching*

Like that of the great prophets, his was a preaching of judgment on Judaism. Compare his lamentation over Jerusalem in Luke xiii., 34, 35, with those words of deep regret over Israel's rejection of her God in Jeremiah xii., 7. On the occasion of his entry into the

<sup>1</sup> See Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, page 375 *ff.*, from which I have quoted freely.

Holy City (Luke xix., 41-44), how similar is his lamentation to those contained in Isaiah xxix., 3, Hosea x., 14, and xiii., 16; and to the picture of Jerusalem forsaken by God and of Israel restored, in Ezekiel viii., 6, and in chapters x. and xi. (Especially Ezekiel x., 18, 19, xi., 19, 22, 23.) Jesus' prediction of the fall of the temple in Mark xiii., 1, 2, reminds us of Micah iii., 12, Jeremiah xxvi., 18, vii., 1-15, xxvi., 6-9. Similar predictions are found throughout Isaiah. Here Jesus stands with the boldest of the prophets: "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii., 19). Throughout his whole teaching we find this same note directed against the false security of Israel, just as it was a dominating note in the old prophetic message.

More marked, perhaps, than anything else is the likeness between his teaching and the prophetic teaching with regard to the value of the ethical as opposed to the ritual. Like the prophets, he grounds this in his conception of God. We find many parallels here. We have discussed at length his quotation in Matthew ix., 13, xii., 7, from Hosea vi., 6, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." In Matthew xii., 6, he says that *he* is greater than the temple. The teaching of Matthew v., 23, 24, is that the moral must precede the ritual performance if the latter is to have any value. The natural, moral duty of man outweighs the formally religious. (Mark vii., 11.) We have no need to cite special prophetic references on this point. This was a fundamental principle and is found in the prophets from beginning to end. Both Jesus and they were ever pointing away from forms and ceremonies to living realities.

Jesus is at one with the prophets in his universalism.

He refers to Jonah's preaching to the Ninevites. Because these repented they will stand in judgment against unrepentant Israel. So will the Gentile queen of the south because she sought the truth. In his famous sermon at Nazareth, in his preaching concerning the Grace of God, he illustrates by the mission of Elijah and Elisha to the heathen outside of Israel. In this sermon, as we have seen, the Evangelist represents Jesus as declaring at the very opening of his ministry, the Grace of God as something for the Gentiles. In such a passage as Luke xiii., 28, 29, "There shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and yourselves cast forth without. And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. And behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last," we have an analogy to Malachi i., 11 *ff.*, Isaiah xlvi., 6, xlix., 12, lix., 19, and numberless others.

In Mark xii., 1-12, he anticipates the rejection of himself by Israel, and the acceptance of the Gentiles, borrowing a parable similarly couched from Isaiah v., 1-7. The parable of the Marriage Feast in Matthew xxii., 1-14, and of the Great Supper in Luke xiv., 15-24, present this same prophetic universalism. In this teaching he is in especial sympathy with second Isaiah. At many other fundamental points his teaching and that of the prophets were in inner sympathy. His general view of God was the prophetic view. With his view of the Law we have essential and substantial parallels in the prophets. Compare his view of fasting with such passages as Isaiah lviii., 3-7, Zechariah vii., 5-10, and viii., 19. Note how similar his view of the

Sabbath is to that found in such passages as Isaiah i., 13, 14, Amos v., 21-24, and Hosea ix., 5. Again and again did the prophets complain that Israel, though she kept the Sabbath formally, "profaned" it by an unholy life.

In our previous discussion we saw that with both the formal observation of the Law was without value unless accompanied by an ethical observance. That the prophets, like Jesus, grounded the Law ethically, is evident from such passages as Hosea vi., 6, Jeremiah vi., 19, 20, vii., 21-23, Micah vi., 6-8, Amos v., 22-25, iv., 4, 5, Isaiah i., 11-17, and Hosea viii., 13. Compare especially Mark xii., 33, 34, with 1 Samuel, xv., 25. With regard to purifications compare the saying in Mark vii., 6, 7, with Isaiah i., 16., xxix., 13, and lxiv., 5. With regard to the presence of God in the temple, compare Matthew v., 34, and xxiii., 22, with Isaiah lxvi., 1. Notice the likeness in Jesus' teaching regarding great and small commands in Matthew xxiii., 23 (Luke xi., 42), to Micah vi., 8. Read the section on the woman taken in adultery in the eighth chapter of John and then read Ezekiel xxxiii., 1-16. His teaching on divorce reminds us of Malachi ii., 15, 16. His estimate of the temple in Mark xi., 17, is expressed in the words of Isaiah lvi., 7, and Jeremiah vii., 11. We thus have a great many points of contact between the teaching of Jesus and that of the prophets. And yet, while Jesus makes this his starting-point, in every case he goes beyond the prophetic idea. But in all his teaching we find reminiscences of the old prophets. As a whole, they foreshadow his message. And this is the true sense in which we are to look for Christ in the prophets. They give expression to ideals which he took up, developed, and perfected.

*2. In His Sufferings and Lot*

Christ shared the common lot of the prophets. As his message was like theirs, so was its reception and rejection. In Mark vi., 1-4, as a prophet he is rejected. In Mark iv., 12, he speaks in parables, "that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest haply they should turn again; and it should be forgiven them." Here he likens himself, his commission, his message, and the manner of its delivery to those of the prophets. (Isaiah vi., 9, 10.) In this instance, like Isaiah, he suffered disappointment and rejection. Like the old Israel to whom the prophets spake (Isaiah xxix., 13), so the Israel of his day was incapable of comprehending spiritual worship. (Mark vii., 6, 7.) The experience of Jeremiah (v., 21) was the same, and he similarly expressed it. The picture of the prophetic servant in Isaiah liii., 7 *ff.*, was applicable to Jesus (Luke xxii., 37).

It is very natural that he should so frequently refer to the fate of the prophets. Again and again he refers to his opponents as stoners and killers of the prophets. They are the sons of them that "slew the prophets." They kill, scourge, crucify, and persecute the prophets. (Matthew xxiii., 34 *ff.*) Jerusalem is mourned over as a place that "killeth the prophets." (Matthew xxiii., 37.) Of that generation would be required "the blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world." (Luke xi., 50.) The first shall be last and the last first; they shall see the prophets whom they have rejected, inside the kingdom of God, and they themselves cast forth. (Luke xiii., 28 *ff.*)

Again and again Jesus shows his sympathy with his great forerunners. His was the last in the succession

of persecutions which they had suffered. (Mark xii., 1-12.) Like every prophet of every age Jesus stood out single-handed against his age and against the rulers of his age. Like every prophet he stands alone.

### 3. *In His Work*

Jesus himself declares his work to be prophetic in character. When the disciples of John the Baptist come to him (Matthew xi., 5) he gives as the evidence of his authority the fact that he executes the prophetic mission as set forth in Isaiah (xxxv., 5, 6, xxix., 18, 19, xlii., 7), giving the words a spiritual significance. In the sermon at Nazareth he quotes the words in which the older prophet had announced his mission, as applicable to his own. His errand, as stated in Luke xix., 10, to seek and to save the lost, is set forth in the terms of Ezekiel xxxiv., 16. In the tenth chapter of John he likens himself to the good shepherd of Ezekiel and Zechariah. It is to be noted here that wherever he cites anticipation of his lot in the prophets, it is in no case done with the idea that his lot is determined by the thing written. Carrying forward, as he does, the work of the prophets to completion, his work naturally has like results to theirs.

We saw another point of contact in the manner of the delivery of his message. Like the prophets, he uses figurative language, appeals to nature, employs parables, and even performs symbolic actions.

Compare the living picture recorded in the Gospels, of our Lord, indignant and wrathful, entering into the temple, armed with a scourge of cords, overturning the tables of the money-changers and the seats of the dove-sellers, driving them all forth with the older prophetic words burning upon his lips, "It is written, my father's

house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of robbers," with similar graphic pictures in the lives of the prophets; with that of Jeremiah standing in the gate of Jehovah's house, boldly accusing the worshippers of lying, oppression, stealing, murder, adultery, false-swearers, and declaring that "this house," which is called by Jehovah's name, is become "a den of robbers" in their eyes.

And what is more probable than that this bold, audacious deed of Jeremiah was the means of inciting the still bolder deed of Jesus? We see here a rising of the genuine old prophetic spirit in Jesus' breast. It breaks forth at other times. When messengers tell him that Herod seeks to kill him, he sends back a bold fling worthy of Elijah or Jeremiah, "Go, tell that fox." His bold answer to Pilate, "Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above," sounds like many a prophetic retort. Time and again as he stands before the Scribes and Pharisees he reminds us of the older prophets as they stood before the priests and rulers of their times. He rebukes in similar terms those sins of Israel which had marked her whole life.

All this likeness between the teaching, the mission, and the personal experience of Jesus and those of the prophets explains his frequent citation of prophecy, his references to it, and his use of prophetic language. We shall find here the key to Jesus' use of prophecy. If the reader will recall our previous discussion he will see that this has been the nature of Jesus' contact with the Old Testament prophetic books. We shall now proceed to draw some more definite conclusions, in the nature of a summary and generalization from our previous discussion.

*Jesus' Choice and Use of Prophecy*

We have already called attention to the fact that, with the whole realm of the Old Testament before him, Jesus chose the prophets. A very large proportion of his citations are from them, especially from those with whom he is most in sympathy. Of the quotations cited it is to be noted that, where directly traceable, nine are from Isaiah, one from Jeremiah, one from Micah, one from Zechariah, one from Malachi, one from Daniel, one from Hosea, and three from the Psalms. Where the quotations are used with reference to their actual teaching in the Old Testament prophecy, and where the teaching of the prophet is applied, six are from Isaiah, one from Jeremiah, one from Micah, and one from Hosea.

We find Jesus using prophecy in a variety of ways. In almost every case it is for homiletical purposes. It is for this purpose that he borrows its language, illustrations, and figures. In Mark xii., 2, he uses familiar prophetic language, largely to attract attention. In Mark xii., 10, 11, its value lies chiefly in its striking terms. In Mark xiv., 27, he borrows mainly the prophetic language, which he uses in a different way from that of the prophet, using it as one would a current proverb. Similarly, in Matthew xi., 23, he uses it with no reference to its original setting, as one would borrow a striking figure. In Luke xx., 18, he again uses it merely for the sake of the figure. His use in Mark iv., 32, is similar to this. Likewise in Luke xxii., 37, he borrows a striking saying and gives it his own independent application. He merely uses the prophetic language in Mark xiii., 12, without any special reference to its original use. John vii., 38, is a mere

generalization. In many of the cases above cited there is no direct connection with the original use of the language in the place from which it is quoted. Jesus' use is best explained by his familiarity with the prophetic vocabulary.

In many cases, the quotation is evidently recalled by reason of similarity of situation and because addressed to a similar audience to that of the prophet. Such instances are Mark iv., 12, xi., 17, xii., 2 *ff.*, xii., 10, 11, vii., 6, 7, Matthew ix., 13 (xii., 7). In some of these cases, similarity of teaching also suggested the use. In Matthew ix., 13, xii., 7, and John vi., 45, he cites the prophetic teaching as authoritative, and gives it a very direct application to his auditors and to his age.

In one instance, Luke iv., 18, 19, he uses the passage as the text for a sermon. He frequently uses prophecy to refute his opponents and critics. In Mark xii., 36, 37, he rebukes their literal and unspiritual use of Scripture in their application of it to the Messiah, condemning them by Scripture itself. Again, in Matthew xi., 10, he denies their literalistic idea of fulfilment. He meets their objections and criticisms by citing Scripture to them, as in Mark xii., 10, 11, where he answers their question as to his authority by declaring his as the authority of the divine messenger. Other instances are Mark vii., 6, 7, Matthew xi., 10, and John x., 34, in the latter of which he answers their objections to his calling himself the Son of God. How frequently he uses the *argumentum ad hominem*, directly applying Scripture to them, as in Mark iv., 12, and vii., 6, 7! He does this less directly in Mark xii., 2 *ff.*, and in a somewhat detailed way in John x., 34, but while in this case dialectical he is not sophistical.

He uses a great deal of freedom in citing. Many of

the quotations are not direct. In most cases they were from memory. He uses composite quotations, double reference, and sometimes seems to be influenced by verbal suggestion. In one instance, John vii., 38, he freely quotes a passage that we cannot trace. He sometimes disregards the literal tenor, and uses the words quoted in a more spiritual sense than the original, as in Luke iv., 18, 19. Although he does all this with a free hand, and uses prophetic language and figures sometimes merely for their own sakes, he always does it with entire fitness. His comparison of John the Baptist to Elijah, in Matthew xi., 10, is strikingly apt. The passage Matthew ix., 13 (xii., 7), was as fitting a text as could have been chosen at the moment. Where he makes a direct application of prophecy it is always with reference to a spiritual truth. In Matthew ix., 13 (xii., 7), he quotes the statement of such a truth. His quotation in Mark iv., 12, teaches the necessity of spiritual discernment. In Mark xi., 17, the teaching is that of the sacredness of God's house. In Mark xii., 2 *ff.*, and Luke xx., 18, he gives the results of the rejection of truth. In Mark vii., 6, 7, his quotation emphasizes the need of inward sincerity in worship. In Luke iv., 18, 19, he uses the prophetic passage to describe the nature of his divine work and the nature of God's Grace. The necessity for being God-taught and God-led is emphasized by the use of the passage quoted in John vi., 45.

#### *Applications to Himself*

When we come to those passages where he applies the prophetic words in any sense to himself, the striking thing is that we find so few of them. We have only four such applications. These are, Mark xii., 10,

11, where he does not cite the passage as written of himself, but uses the Old Testament figure of a stone merely by way of analogy; Luke iv., 18, 19, where prophetic words are used partly in the description of his mission in the world, but mainly as indicating the nature of the Grace of God; Luke xx., 18, where a figure is borrowed; and Luke xxii., 37, simply an illustration. We find nothing at all of a detailed and literal application of Old Testament prophecy to himself. In none of these four instances does Jesus in any way whatever suggest that the passages had anything to do with him in their original meaning. On the contrary, we have two emphatic and explicit denials of the value and correctness of any such application (Mark xii., 36, 37, Matthew xi., 10). In these two cases he rebukes the detailed application of Scripture.

### *Standard of Value*

In quoting prophecy Jesus made distinct choice. That choice was on the basis of spiritual affinity. He uses, in the main, and where he directly quotes, passages which contain great principles; truths good for all time. He seeks the living word of God as it is in the prophets. He gives to prophecy its true meaning and significance. He does not aim to establish any literal connection between himself and prophecy, or indeed any connection at all. Many sources which would have been available for such use, and which a later exegesis did use, have no existence for him. There is significance in the prophets and sections of prophecy which he does not use. We do not find him taking pains to adjust his life to prophetic details, nor did he notice any such details. When he finds, in reference

to his sufferings, anticipated parallels in the prophets to his own lot, he never suggests that his lot was determined by the thing written. It is simply the repetition of history. Continuing the work of the prophets, as their successor, accepting as he did the ruling ideas of the prophetic message, he would naturally find in the prophets anticipations of his own work. In his sufferings and death he does share the prophetic lot. It is to be noted that he does not use those passages most suitable to bring out the idea of the personal Messianic hope. He appeals to passages which describe the ideal of Israel, rather than to those which describe a personal head. Of this nature are those of Deutero-Isaiah. He uses passages which are descriptive of Israel rather than of Israel's king.

His teaching is like that of the prophets in that, like theirs, it was founded on a revelation. There is, however, one significant difference. While the divine inspiration comes to the prophets spasmodically, in specially elevated moments, as a more or less foreign influence coming from without, in Jesus it is the calm, continuous stream. He knows nothing of special ecstasies of revelation. With him revelation is as an unceasing spring in the soul. He is not the mere messenger; he himself is the message.

#### *The Nature of Prophecy as Understood by Jesus*

If, at this point, we pause to consider the nature of Old Testament prophecy itself, we shall best see that aspect of it which concerned Jesus. In prophecy we distinguish two different elements. One is the concrete, definite, and historical. The other is the ideal and general. One deals with facts; the other with principles. Considered in the light of the first element

of prophecy, the historical, the prophets were not mere predictors. They were preachers; preachers for their age, concerned supremely with the present and the near future. When we do find prediction, it is, in the main, concrete, definite, and literal. Its fulfilment was to be immediate. And where we have prediction, its largest fulfilment was not in the actual coming to pass of the events which the prophets foresaw, but rather the victory of their truth and principles. The real fulfilment was the Jewish Church, the creative work of the prophets, which finally gave us Christ and Christianity. Prophecy, in the self-consciousness of the prophets, was the reflection on earth of the divine ideal in relation to human affairs. Institutions, events, and persons were the media of this. Prophecy was fulfilled, primarily, as fast as the Kingdom of God came. This is by far the ruling idea of prophecy. That portion of prophecy which is generally considered as distinctly Messianic forms a very small portion of the prophetic books. The principal value of prophecy was in its foreshadowing of that ideal which was realized in Jesus Christ. Thus, in one sense, all prophecy is Messianic. Indeed, the question is not definitely answered as to whether we have in the Old Testament a Messianic hope in the narrow personal sense. At all events this is entirely subordinate to the larger idea.

Suppose, for a moment, that there is in the Old Testament a personal and individual Messianic picture. Is there any possibility of its fulfilment in detail? As a matter of fact there is no consistent picture. The great personage is glorified in different aspects. During the time of the monarchy he is pictured as an ideal theocratic king. Later, he is set forth as a priest. During the Exile he disappears and gives place to a

personalized idea representing Jahwe himself. How impossible to conceive of any literal fulfilment in the light of all this variety. It is clear that the prophets connected their ideas very closely with the present ; shaped them in accordance with their own time and with reference to events then happening.

But when we look at prophecy in the other and larger conception, fulfilment becomes a possible and a natural thing. The general prophetic picture is the same in all the prophets. They hoped and longed for the same ideal. The fulfilment of the ideal was possible and inevitable.

It was this latter view of prophecy which Jesus shared. When he looked for connection at all, he looked for this inner, spiritual sense of connection between himself and the past. When he connected the New and the Old, he sought, not the external harmony which could not be found, but the internal, spiritual harmony which he could and did find. Hence, with him, the national and particular was set aside ; the universal and spiritual was brought out. In this sense, with this recognition of the ideal of prophecy, Jesus realized himself as fulfilling it. We have seen that in his exposition of Psalm cx., 1, he denied the value of the literal and particular, and emphasized the worth of the general. Indeed, we may go further, and say that Jesus actually denies the details of the prophetic picture in its concrete form. That picture, as far as it appeared in prophecy, represented him as a theocratic king over a temporal kingdom. The Messianic picture, in the main, is not that of the Son of Man who had not where to lay his head ; but of one who sat in royal glory. Jesus was no more the Messiah of the Old Testament than his Kingdom of God was the Jewish Theocracy.

Looking at prophecy in this broader interpretation, Jesus could adopt consistently its various pictures, as he did. Thus he can use the figure of the Son of Man exalted in Daniel, and also that of the meek and lowly one of Zechariah. The harmony is moral but not mechanical. It is only in this way that these ideal personalities, collectively, are fulfilled in one person.

### *Jesus' Messianic Idea*

We need now to consider just what Jesus' Messianic idea was. That theological view by which Jesus has been conceived of as literally fulfilling Old Testament prophecy finds its basis in the fact that Jesus claimed to be, and was, the Messiah. Jesus certainly claimed to be the Messiah. He claimed to be the Messiah of the Old Testament. We must remember that in his time variant and conflicting views of the Messiah were deduced from the Old Testament. It is certain that Jesus could not literally conform to all these ideas. It is just as certain that he did not conform to the general conception of his time. That idea was so mixed up with idle dreams, ambitions, and shams, based on a literal and microscopic exegesis, that Jesus had to break away from it here, and he did so. He denied the prevalent conception of the Messiah, and at the same time condemned the method by which they arrived at it. Jesus' conception of the Messiah was not taken from descriptions found in prophecy. It was his own spiritual nature which determined its form. Wherever he does draw from prophecy, it is from sources not individually Messianic. Jesus did not use Messianic terms. The term Son of Man was not Messianic. He utterly destroys the detailed picture of prophecy. While, on the one hand,

he views the Kingdom of God as in fundamental harmony with the Old Testament revelation of the grace and will of God, on the other, he can dispense entirely with its local form in the Old Testament.

### *Fulfilment*

In the light of all this, what does Jesus mean by fulfilment? What does he mean when he says, "Think not that I came to destroy the Law and the Prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil"? We have seen that this verb is used in a variety of ways in the New Testament. In the first place, it is certain that Jesus would not mean one thing in the case of the Law, and a totally different thing in the case of the Prophets. *O νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται* means the whole Old Testament taken together. It does not relate merely to prophetic predictions. Hence Jesus fulfilled prophecy in precisely the same sense as he fulfilled the Law. Now we know what Christ's attitude towards the Law was. It was that of an absolute disregard of the letter. How was it with regard to the Law? At the fulfilment in Jesus, and as a consequence of this fulfilment, the particular, the detailed, all dropped away. Laws gave way to law, the law of love. So with prophecy, the temporal, the formal, the detailed, slipped away. Definite programmes gave way to the general ideal of truth which they had imperfectly set forth. In Jesus' fulfilment of Law and Prophets, he refers to his perfect revelation of the *comprehensive* moral purpose and plan of God. Hence *πληρωσάι* cannot here mean fulfilment of the prophets as detailed announcers of future things. Jesus' meaning must be, fulfilment of spirit and purpose. In this way he can truly say that he fulfils the Law and the Prophets. He fulfils their ideal. He fulfils both of

them *as a whole*. He saw in both a reaching out toward an ideal which was his, and which he was conscious of embodying in his personal message. He brings to *perfect* expression what they imperfectly expressed. Realizing this ideal, he fulfils the Law and the Prophets. Beyschlag calls it a "didactic fulfilment"; "a perfection and completion in virtue of which the inmost meaning . . . is to be set forth and made authoritative as it had not been in the Old Testament form. . . . He fulfils the Law and the Prophets by bringing about what they aim at, the Kingdom of Heaven or the Kingdom of God." Riehm insists on a distinction between prophecy and fulfilment. The two must not be confused. He says that prophecy is what the prophet, in his age and circumstances and dispensation, meant; Fulfilment is the form in which his great religious conception will gain validity in other ages, in different circumstances, and under another dispensation. Certain elements, therefore, of the relative, the circumstantial, and the dispensational must be stripped away and not expected to go into fulfilment. (*Messianic Prophecy*, "Introduction," page xvi.) Prophecy, then, was fulfilled by the coming of the Kingdom of God with him. As Wendt remarks: "It was not by quantitative extension, but by qualitative renewal that he designed to bring the Law and the Prophets to fulfilment." Hühn has the following admirable summing up of Jesus attitude toward prophecy:

"Die Evangelien ziegen uns, dass Jesus als Messias nicht die sinnliche Seite der prophetischen Zukunftsbilder betont hat; vgl. die Versuchungsgeschichte Mt. iv., 1-11, L. iv., 1-13. Dass ein neues Band zwischen Gott und der Menschheit geknüpft werden müsse, dieser Gedanke stand im Mittelpunkte des religiösen Lebens Christi und bedingte seine ganze Wirk-

samkeit; vgl. Mt. xxvi., 28; Mc. xiv., 24; L. xxii., 20; 1 K. xi., 25. Stellen wie Jer. xxxi., 31-34<sup>2</sup> fanden in seinem Herzen vor allem Aufnahme. Er hat ferner keinen Nachdruck auf die Worte des Alten Testaments gelegt, welche als Weissagungen auf einzelne Ereignisse seines Lebens angesehen werden konnten. Jesus, der uns überall die Wahrheit des Wortes entgegenhält, dass der Buchstabe tötet, der Geist aber lebendig macht, lässt den Eintritt in das Reich Gottes nicht von dem Glauben an solche Weissagungen abhängig sein. Auf welche Weise man nach seiner Lehre zum ewigen Leben gelangt, sieht man aus Mt. xix., 17, xxii., 37-40; L. x., 25-28.

“Allerdings hat sich Jesus durch exegetische Voraussetzungen, die er mit seiner Zeit teilte, irreführen lassen und hat z. B. Ps. cx. auf den Messias bezogen. Während es hier ungewiss bleibt, ob er die Anwendung desselben auf seine Person hat machen oder ablehnen wollen, hat auf seine Erwartung seiner Wiederkunft das Buch Daniel gegen Ende seines Lebens entscheidenden Einfluss ausgeübt und ihm ziemlich viel äusserliche und obendrein unerfüllt gebliebene Hoffnungen geliefert. Aber für den Kern seiner Persönlichkeit ist dies ohne tiefergehenden Einfluss geblieben; für diesen waren Ideen des Alten Testaments massgebend wie die von Gott als Vater (z. B. Mal. ii., 10; Ps. lxxviii., 6, ciii., 13), von der Liebe zu ihm und dem Nächsten (Dt. vi., 5; Lev. xix., 18; vgl., Mt. xxii., 37-39; Mc. xii., 30, 31 u. a.), von der Barmherzigkeit im Vorzug vor dem Fasten und Opfer (Jes. lviii., 5-7; Hos. vi., 6; vgl., Mt. ix., 13, xii., 7), Ideen, die mit der messianischen Hoffnung gar nichts zu thun haben.”—Hühn, *Die messianischen Weissagungen u. s. w.*, pages 9, 10.

Thus, Jesus could deplore and rebuke that method of interpretation which concerned itself with such questions of Messianic fulfilment as blood-relationship to David; while at the same time he could say, I came to fulfil the Prophets. In me you see the realization of the prophetic hope and ideal. As Wellhausen remarks: “Jesus wollte nicht auflösen, sondern erfüllen, d. h. den Intentionen zum vollen

Ausdruck verhelfen." It is because this is his conception that he can say, even of the Law, whose letter he so ruthlessly abrogates: "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the Law, till all things be accomplished (or fulfilled)."

Indeed, he goes on and illustrates just what he means by fulfilment here. The righteousness of his disciples must be a more complete righteousness than that of the older law. (Matthew v., 20.) "To them of old time" it was said, "Thou shalt not kill." But Jesus brings what this law sought to attain to perfection. Men must go beyond this and not think murder in the heart. (Matthew v., 21 *ff.*). He does away with the specific demand in the larger general demand. The command to avoid the lustful thought and glance fulfils the old commandment in substituting a universal principle for a specific act. (Matthew v., 27 *ff.*) But Jesus goes further and absolutely sets aside and abrogates some of these laws. He denies their validity. He fulfils them in that he breaks their letter in order to bring about in larger measure their general intention. (Matthew v., 33 *ff.*, and v., 38 *ff.*) Love for friends and hatred for enemies must give place to love for all. Our Lord's idea of fulfilment is made very clear throughout this whole chapter. And he brings it to final expression when he says, "Be ye perfect." (Matthew v., 48.) He fulfils the Law in that he brings it to perfection.

Now, as we have said, he cannot mean one thing in the case of the Law and a totally different thing in the case of the Prophets when he says in one breath, I have come to fulfil Law and Prophets. His fulfilment of prophecy is also a bringing of it to completion, to perfection.

Of both Law and Prophets he fulfilled that in them which was of real, eternal significance, their spiritual hope and ideal, and that is the only kind of fulfilment he ever sought or cared anything at all about. One who summarized the Law and the Prophets in that one word, Love (Matthew xxii., 40), could declare that he fulfills them as a whole. He fulfils them as a whole. He accomplishes their great central aims. In that they comprehended the moral purpose of God he brings them to pass. This is the great characteristic of all our Lord's teaching. He does not destroy the old ideal. He takes up that old ideal and enforces, completes, illustrates, and applies it to the life of men.

And this means infinitely more, it gives far more certain proof of the real Messiahship of Jesus, than that fulfilment so vainly sought by Scribe and Rabbi, the correspondence of insignificant detail. Our Lord fulfilled the prophets in that he succeeded to their work, took up and illumined their ideals and in his own person and life set them in living words before the eyes of men. And it is only when we see prophecy thus fulfilled that prophecy itself reveals its significance and becomes fully intelligible. In his person and in his work he brought to complete expression the prophetic ideal; in his teaching he unified, vitalized, and completed prophetic doctrines. That ruling prophetic idea of the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the world was realized in the Kingdom of our Lord. That Kingdom, as the prophets had foreseen and declared, starting within Israel, has gone out through all the earth to every nation.

In this largest sense, Christ was in the Old Testament and in the prophets. Christ was there in so far as we find his spirit there. Christ fulfilled that in the

prophets which breathed his spirit. The revelation of God, set forth by prophetic tongue and pen, increasing in illumination and in power from age to age, was completed in our Lord, in whom " dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

## CHAPTER VII

### COMPARISONS OF JESUS' VIEW OF PROPHECY WITH THAT OF THE RABBIS ; PHILO ; THE SYNOPTISTS ; THE WRITER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL, AND OTHER WRITERS

TO do justice to this part of our work would require a book by itself. It would be an interesting and fruitful study, but it is not deemed best to burden the present volume with an exhaustive discussion. The most that can be done is to indicate by a brief comparison the wide difference between our Lord's use of the Scriptures and that of his contemporaries. At no time does the loftiness of our Lord's thought appear more clearly than when we see him among other men.

#### *The Rabbis*

#### *Palestinian-Jewish Literature*

At no point do we find a greater contrast to Jesus' view and use of Old Testament prophecy than in those of the Palestinian-Jewish method as seen in the rabbinical exegesis. We shall only indicate briefly its grounds and its main features. The profound and superstitious reverence for Scripture, the conviction of the absolute literal perfection of the Law and the Prophets, led to the belief that they contained *everything*. The Rabbis were thus enabled to find in Scripture anything they

needed for any purpose. Their interpretation ran in two directions. They sought, first, literalness of fulfilment. But where a desired truth was not found in the letter a spiritualizing process was resorted to by which a hidden meaning was discovered. Every sentence, every word, had an independent significance. On the other hand, every sentence or word was a symbol, with a mysterious content corresponding to almost anything that the imagination could see. Any meaning was given to a word that could *in any way* be extracted from it. The choice of the literal or the allegorical interpretation depended on the argument to be supported. The connections of a passage of Scripture were totally disregarded.

A few illustrations of rabbinical exegesis will indicate the wide difference between Jesus' scriptural views and those of the Rabbis. The latter say, for example, that when a man lies three days in the grave, his entrails are torn from his body and cast in his face; because it is written in Malachi ii., 3, "Behold, I . . . will spread filth upon your faces, even the filth of your solemn feasts." In his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Ebrard, in addition to the above example, also cites the rabbinical teaching on the transmigration of the soul, and that the souls of men remain alive in men; for which they give as an example the scriptural statement that the life of Cain passed into Jethro, his spirit into Korah, and his soul into the Egyptians. This remarkable result is obtained as the result of the fact that two words are found in Genesis iv., 24, containing the first letters of the words Jethro, Korah, and Egyptians.

"From whence is it," asks a rabbinical interpreter, "that God wears the phylactery? From Isaiah lxii.,

8, where it reads, 'Jehovah hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength.' The right hand signifies the law, according to Deut. xxxiii., 2, 'At his right hand was a fiery law unto them.' The arm of his strength indicates the phylactery, because it is written, 'Jehovah will give strength unto his people.' "

In the Song of Songs, vii., 9, the phrase, "Gliding through the lips of those that are asleep," or "causing the lips of those that are asleep to move or speak," which refers of course to the effect of wine, is rabbini-cally interpreted as signifying that when the living say anything of the dead, the lips of the latter move in the grave.

When God comes into the Synagogue and does not find ten persons there, He is angry, because it is written in Isaiah 1., 2, "Wherefore when I came, was there no man?" As a matter of fact, in this passage the prophet gives a profound teaching with regard to the omnipotence of God.

Compare our Lord's teaching regarding divorce and the Old Testament passage he uses to enforce it, with this rabbinic interpretation of Genesis xvi., 3, concerning Hagar: "The text teaches us, that when one lives with his wife *ten years* and has no children, he is to divorce her; as the text says: 'After—at the end of *ten years*, that Abram had no children by Sarai, then Sarai gave Hagar to Abram.' "

With regard to the question as to whether man is sinful from conception or only from birth, the latter view is held on the basis of Genesis iv., 7, "Sin coucheth at the door."

The passage in Genesis i., 2, regarding the moving of the spirit upon the face of the waters, is applied as

an injunction with regard to a crass, physical indisposition.

As we should expect, all this sort of ingenuity found full play in connection with the Messianic hope.

Psalm xcv., 10, "Forty years long was I grieved with that generation," means that the Messianic period shall be forty years. But, again, according to another it must continue seventy years, because it is written that "Tyre shall be forgotten seventy years." (Isaiah xxiii., 15.) A combination of Psalm xc., 15, "Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us," and Genesis xv., 13, "They shall afflict them four hundred years," indicates four hundred years as the "days of the Messiah." A similar combination of Isaiah lxii., 5, "and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee," and the Jewish saying regarding a thousand years being as one day with God (quoted in 2 Peter iii., 8), in view of the seven days of the marriage festival, indicates seven thousand years for Messiah's reign.

A rabbinic commentator, treating of the passage Genesis xi., 10-28, beginning "These are the generations of Shem," asks, "Why is it told how long these people lived, and that they begat sons and daughters, —and why is it not mentioned, as in the case of the men from Adam to Noah, that they died?" And his ingenious solution is: "Because from Shem descended the House of David, and the Messiah who lives forever, as it is stated in the Scripture, 'He asked life of Thee and Thou gavest it to him, even length of days forever.'"

In Genesis xlvii., 29, Joseph says: "Bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt." Among other extraordinary reasons for the request, one Rabbi gives this, Because

when the dead in the outside land will rise at the advent of the Messiah, they will have to roll under mountains and through caves, to reach the land of Israel, which will be very painful to them.

Another Messianic touch: When Jacob called his sons and said, "Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the latter days" (Genesis xl ix., 1), he intended to tell them when Messiah would come. But the Shechinah departed from him too soon and he spoke other words than those he intended.

Genesis i., 3: "And God said, Let there be light." The meaning of this passage is that, after the captivity, God will "enlighten" us and send us the Messiah, concerning whom it is said in Isaiah lx., 1: "Arise, shine, for thy *light* is come."

Ruth i., 1, refers to the Messiah. Let the reader discover the reference if he can. Ruth iii., 15, speaks of him also. Is it not clear? The six measures of barley refer to six righteous ones, of whom the last is the Messiah, and each of whom would have six special blessings. In Psalm ii., 3 (4), "Jahwe is a man of war" is applied to the Messiah. Is. xxv., 8, is applied to the casting into Gehenna of Satan and the Gentiles.

Quite generally the passages in Isaiah xi. describing the restoration and harmonization of nature were taken literally. Many interpreters reasoned in this way: In the time of Messiah the nature of wild beasts and of cattle shall be changed, and return to what it was when they were originally created, and in the ark of Noah; for if when first created the lion fed upon sheep, then the creation would have been destroyed.

We saw in the discussion by Jesus of similar pas-

sages in Isaiah referring to a miraculous removal of earthly wants, that he gave them a spiritual significance.

Of course it is a generally accepted fact that our Lord's conception of Messiahship and of the Kingdom of God was at absolute variance at nearly every significant point with that of contemporary Judaism. We find a parallel in the manner of treating the Old Testament in the matter. In building up their Messianic scheme, the Rabbis used the Old Testament in a literal way. Malachi iii., 23, 24, was given a strictly literal interpretation. We saw that our Lord regarded this requirement of his contemporaries as a trivial one and to their insistence on Elijah's coming he replies: If you will insist on the coming of Elijah, there is John the Baptist. If you will have it so, he is your Elijah. An Elijah has come, and because of your narrow literalness, you failed to see and recognize him. Jesus rebukes this literal expectation. Another element in the contemporary Messianic scheme was that Messiah should be a son of David. But again we saw that Jesus declared this to be of no significance whatever. Over against their conception of Messiah as son of David he placed the conception of Messiah as Son of God.

We can see Jesus' point of view in its difference from that of contemporary Judaism in his choice of the Scripture he uses. The tendency of Scribe and Rabbi was to place the prophets in a subordinate position to that of the Law. Regarding revelation and inspiration, comparing Moses with the prophets, it was held that Moses "saw in a clear glass, the prophets in a dark one," or again, Moses "through one glass, they through seven." It was considered that the prophets uttered nothing valuable that had not already been

given in the Law. Jesus by both precept and example takes the opposite view. His predilection was for the prophetic writers.

These examples, cited from Döpke's *Hermeneutik* and other works,<sup>1</sup> are sufficient to indicate the literal and unspiritual interpretation of the Rabbis, and to show how far removed from it our Lord was. While in the rabbinic interpretation we see little or no choice in citing Scripture, every word being of equal value, we find Jesus making a distinct choice, on the ground of spiritual value. We see absolutely nothing, in his use, of all this extravagance of method. Indeed, as we have seen, in Matthew xv., 3-6 (Mark vii., 9-13), Jesus dealt a death-blow to that traditionalism which, pretending to be based on Scripture, in reality absolutely contradicted it.

In every case which we have discussed, we have seen that Jesus looked for and found just what the text he used had to say. Not so the Scribes. The real tenor of the words was lost sight of in their straining after logical deduction, combination, and allegory. Nothing so clearly indicates the naturalness, simplicity, and spirituality of our Lord as a comparison of his view of Scripture with that of his age and race.<sup>2</sup>

Edersheim remarks concerning "the infinite differ-

<sup>1</sup> See Johnson, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*, chapter xi.

<sup>2</sup> Among other works the reader is referred to the discussions of rabbinical and scribal interpretation in the following works:

Mielziner—*Introduction to the Talmud*.

Weber, F.—*Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandten Schriften*.

Schürer—*The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. I. 1. Section 3—E. "The Rabbinical Literature." II. 1.

ence between the rabbinic expectation of the Messiah, and the picture of him presented in the New Testament," and adds, "surely the Messianic idea, as realized in Christ, could not have been derived from the views current in those times."

The difference of method in deducing from Scripture is as great as the difference in the results produced by it.

### *Philo*

#### *Hellenistic-Jewish Literature*

When we turn to the Hellenistic-Jewish interpretation of Scripture as illustrated especially in Philo of Alexandria, we find an equally great contrast. In part, Philo went the same road as the Rabbis and the faults and falsities of his method are of the same general sort. His allegorical canons are similar to those underlying the Jewish traditions of the Haggada. For him the Pentateuch was the choice portion of Scripture. Moses was, to Philo, the incomparably great philosopher and teacher. All the wise men had learned from him. In him was all truth to be found, both in the letter and underneath the letter of his teachings.

Philo recognized both a literal and an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. He held to the real personality of the Old Testament personages. But he went beyond this consideration of them. They must be interpreted allegorically. According to Philo's symbolism Section 25—"Scribism." II. 2. Section 29—"The Messianic Hope."

More complete bibliographies will be found in these works.  
Also :

Edersheim—*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii., Appendices II., III., V., VIII., IX., XI., XIV.

*Ibid.*—Vol. i., Book I., "Traditionalism."

the patriarchs represented different states of the human soul. Joseph was justly hated by his brethren, for he represented the fleshly. Simeon was the soul aspiring to the higher. The murder of the Egyptian by Moses signified the defeat and overthrow of passion. In the treatise in which he contends "That the Worse is Accustomed to be Always Plotting against the Better," Abel represents the God-loving; Cain the self-loving. To meet the necessities of this kind of exegesis, Philo claimed freedom, even in altering the punctuation and the free choosing of synonyms for a word, in order to meet his special meaning. He claimed divine authority for the Septuagint; and any word in it might be considered in the light of any possible turning of its Greek meaning. Sometimes he even altered the letters. He found significant symbolism in numbers, colors, and materials as well as in names. Beasts, fowls, creeping things, plants, stones, and sex had a like significance.

In a general sense it may be said that Philo's exegesis and that of the Rabbis were at one with each other. Many of Philo's doctrines as deduced from Scripture have high ethical value, but the method by which he deduced them was mechanical, arbitrary, and grotesque. His view of the Holy Writings was totally different from that of Jesus. As in the case of the interpretations of the Rabbis, his choice was different from that of Jesus, and on different grounds. It was indiscriminate in its discrimination. The Pentateuch was his realm. It was his source for doctrine. Jesus, on the other hand, sought the more ethical and spiritual portions of Scripture in the prophets. The Pentateuch belonged to them "of old time." Both in choice and method of use there is the wide difference of ages be-

tween our Lord and the Hellenistic-Jewish interpreters of his time.<sup>1</sup>

Thus in both Palestinian and Hellenistic-Jewish interpretation we see a world-wide contrast with that of Jesus, both as regards choice of sections of the Old Testament and as to the still greater difference in his method of use. These were methods with which he seems to have had nothing at all to do. The difference lies largely in what Jesus did *not* do. The questions which concerned these scholars of his time were not such as concerned Christ. He used Scripture, not to set forth matters of casuistry, but great ethical and spiritual principles. For this purpose letter worship had nothing to furnish.

When we come to consider the use of Scripture by the writers of the four Gospels, while we shall find in them a certain dependence on rabbinic exegesis, we shall find theirs a far more cautious and spiritual use. They were distinctly above their contemporaries in clearness and loftiness of spiritual conception, and in ethical discrimination. They could not be uninfluenced by the method of their master. And yet their exegesis

<sup>1</sup> The reader is referred to the following works :

Drummond, J.—*Philo Judæus*.

Young—*The Works of Philo Judæus*.

And especially :

Siegfried—*Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*.

Edersheim—*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. Appendix II. contains a discussion on “Philo of Alexandria and Rabbinic Theology.”

*Ibid.*—Vol. i., Book I., chapter iv., “Philo of Alexandria,” etc.

Schlüter—*The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. See Index, “Philo the Jewish Philosopher.”

is by much the same method and principle as that of their time, and yields in some measure the same results. In contrast to all this we find Jesus absolutely free and independent.

*The Synoptists*

*The First Gospel*

In this Gospel, about one fourth of the citations from the Old Testament are from the hand of the writer (or writers) himself; and they have the evident and frequently expressed intention of proving the Messiahship of Jesus. This is especially true of those quotations which are not supported by the other Gospels. There is no doubt that, so far as the first Gospel has a "tendency," it is in the direction of this effort to convince the Jews and the Jewish Christians of the doctrine that Jesus is the Messiah of the Old Testament and of Israel. The first Gospel is more than a mere narrative; it is an argument. This does not imply that its plan and composition has been so conceived and carried out as to destroy its historical credibility. The narrative has, however, been cast in this framework. Its writer looks at Jesus' life and mission, and regards the Gospel, from a point of view taken on the basis of the Old Testament prophecies as literal predictions. Throughout the Gospel, we see an effort to represent the events in Jesus' life as fulfilling these. While he is faithful in rendering the discourses of Jesus, he does give them a cast and application in which he is influenced by his view.

In Matthew i., 22, Jesus is born of a virgin, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, And they shall

call his name Immanuel." According to this writer he was born in Bethlehem evidently to fulfil that which was "written through the prophet" in Micah v., 2 (Matthew ii., 5). John vii., 41, 42, seems to contradict this by implication. In Herod's slaughter of the children, "was fulfilled that which was spoken through Jeremy the prophet," in Jeremiah xxxi., 15. Joseph fled to *Egypt*, rather than elsewhere, in order to fulfil the words of Hosea xi., 1, "Out of Egypt did I call my son," words which were wrested from their setting by the Evangelist. In Hosea, they have no predictive significance whatever, being merely a historical statement of a fact, namely, that God led Israel out of Egypt. Similarly Jesus was taken to Nazareth (ii., 23), "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophets that he should be called a Nazarene," a reference which probably has some remote typical connection, which cannot be satisfactorily determined. According to iv., 14, Jesus dwells in Capernaum, "which is by the sea, in the borders of Zebulon and Naphtali; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet" (Isaiah ix., 1, 2). In xii., 16 *ff.*, Jesus' healings are performed, and he charges the healed that they should not make him known, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet," referring to Isaiah xlii., 1-3. Just what the connection is it is hard to see. In viii., 17, he cast out spirits and healed the sick, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases" (Isaiah liii., 4). In this instance, it may be that the departure from the Septuagint text in favor of the Hebrew, which best suits the application, was the result of this interest in fulfilment.

Jesus even spake in parabolic form to fulfil a prophecy of Psalm lxxviii., 2 (Matthew xiii., 35). Even the matter of the price paid the traitor, according to xxvii., 9 *ff.*, had been prearranged in the prophets, according to the arbitrary connection made by this writer. Here the reference is evidently to Zechariah xi., 13, although the Evangelist wrongly attributes it to Jeremiah. In the purchase of the potter's field, "as the Lord appointed," the writer refers to Jeremiah xxxii., 6-9; influenced possibly by Jeremiah xviii., 1, 2.

There are instances in which the writer of the first Gospel expands the narrative of the source which he is following, by the introduction of more explicit reference to the fulfilment of prophecy. We have such a case in xiii., 14, 15, where he duplicates and adds to the general illustration in the words of Jesus a complete quotation. In xxi., 4, 5, he adds the definite comment, "Now this is to come to pass that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophet." Here he alters the form of the historic narrative in order to fit his misunderstanding of the Hebrew in the passage quoted.<sup>1</sup> In xxvi., 54, a comparison with the parallels shows that he adds the words of Jesus with regard to the twelve legions of angels, closing with, "How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?"

In Matthew xii., 40, where Jesus refers to the preaching of Jonah as a sign, this writer interpreted the prophetic reference with regard to the resurrection, whereas this is not Jesus' meaning at all.<sup>2</sup> In Matthew v., 48,

<sup>1</sup> See our previous discussion in Chapter V., "The Triumphal Entry."

<sup>2</sup> See our previous discussion in Chapter V., "The Sign of Jonah the Prophet."

we have a variation from Luke vi., 36. In place of Luke's *οικτιρμονες* Matthew has *τελειοι*. Luke's seems to be the correct rendering, and it is not improbable that Matthew's change is to make the saying correspond more literally with Genesis xvii., 1, where the word **תמים** is used.

We are not concerned here either to attack or to defend the hermeneutics of the first Evangelist. They show the literary influence of his age. There is a likeness to the Talmudic exegesis. It is used, however, with much more caution and in a much worthier cause. But we cannot fail to see that we have here a mechanical literalness, a subtle correspondence, which stands in striking contrast with the profound spiritual use and interpretation of prophecy by Jesus. The contrast is very great. We found nothing of this literal and detailed use by Jesus. With regard to this question a writer says, "It is evidently possible that God may have providentially ordered that there should be these correspondences, even of a minute kind, between incidents of the life of Jesus and the language of ancient Scriptures, for the express purpose of being so many finger-posts pointing him out as the Christ, for men to whose minds such indications would appeal." We would only say that Jesus either was oblivious of the divine purpose, or else set aside this divinely given opportunity, and wilfully preferred to rest his personal claims upon himself, his life, and his truth. We think it more probable that we are to see here, not a clearer insight of the Evangelist; but rather a limitation of the Evangelist by the needs and methods of his age. In Jesus we see a spiritual vision which lifted him above all this.

*The Second Gospel*

The Gospel according to Mark does not offer much opportunity for comparison. Its writer was supremely concerned to set forth the simple life of Jesus. He does not enter into doctrinal questions. The argumentative element concerning our Lord's fulfilment of prophecy, such as we found in the first Gospel, is lacking in the second. There is not, in the whole Gospel of Mark, a single case of the kind of prophetic reference such as we found forming the very framework of the first Gospel. And we have only two references of any kind, both in the fourteenth chapter. In Mark xiv., 21, we have "For the son of man goeth even as it is written of him." Matthew has the same. But significantly enough Luke has: "For the son of man indeed goeth as it hath been determined." Whichever be the correct rendering, Luke clearly gives the meaning. Our Lord is merely represented as saying, "I go to meet my inevitable lot."

We have a similar passage in Mark xiv., 49: "But that the scriptures might be fulfilled." Matthew expands on this: "But all this is come to pass, that the scriptures of *the prophets* might be fulfilled" (Matthew xxvi., 56). Here again we have a significantly different rendering in Luke: "But this is your hour and the power of darkness."

With the exception of these two very general and indefinite passages, the Gospel of Mark knows nothing of the correspondences which the writer of the first Gospel so industriously sought out.

*The Third Gospel*

The writer of the Gospel of Luke makes only three direct references to the Old Testament writings. In

ii., 23, 24, the Law is cited in explanation of a Jewish custom. In iii., 4-6, he likens the mission of John the Baptist to that described by Isaiah the prophet. In i., 17, in the description of John the Baptist, Malachi iv., 6, is cited.

In several instances, peculiarly enough, this Gospel puts different words in Jesus' mouth from those of the other accounts, where this question of prophecy-fulfilment is involved. In Luke xxiii., 46, it puts a different quotation on Jesus' lips, when on the cross. In our last section we discussed two cases where he has a totally different rendering from both Matthew and Mark, namely Luke xxii., 22, and xxii., 53. In our textual comparisons of the quotations of Jesus we saw that this writer was not at all concerned in preserving Old Testament references. We find, on the whole, in this Gospel little interest in the matter of preserving, identifying, and comparing events in our Lord's life with Old Testament prophecies or predictions. In the main he presents such only where he is recording sayings of Jesus himself. Unlike the writer of the first Gospel he does no comparing on his own account. One has only to compare the accounts of Matthew and Luke concerning the birth and early days of Jesus, and concerning his passion and death, to see the differing interests of these two writers.

In fact, in some cases, either the writer of Matthew or Mark has changed his sources in this interest, or else Luke has purposely eliminated the predictive feature, unless he had or chose a source unlike that of either of the other two. Take, for example, Luke xxii., 22, and xxii., 53. In the first instance, Luke has, "For the son of man indeed goeth *as it hath been determined*," where the other two Synoptists have, "even as it is

written of him." Luke uses the verb *οριξω*, while the others use the stereotyped *γεγραπται*. Again, in regard to Luke xxii., 37, we have discussed the changes of language. Here Luke has *τελεσθηναι*=brought to pass, completed, accomplished; and *τελος* = end; where the other writers would probably have used the verb *πληρωω* = "fulfil."

In verse 53 of the same chapter we have a very significant change. The parallel in Matthew xxvi., 56, reads: "But all this is come to pass that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled"; and in Mark xiv., 49: "But that the scriptures might be fulfilled." Strangely enough, Luke reads: "But this is your hour and the power of darkness." Indeed, there is not, in the third Gospel, a single suggestion of any interest in this matter of Scripture-fulfilment, until we come to the eighteenth chapter. After this we do have a half-dozen mere suggestions of something of the kind.

The first of these is Luke xviii., 31: "And he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, *and all the things that are written through the prophets shall be accomplished* (*τελεσθησεται*) *unto the son of man.*" The italicized phrase is found only in Luke. Here is a case exactly the opposite of the change in Luke xxii., 22. It may be that Luke has taken the words found in the parallels to Luke xxii., 22, and inserted them here instead of in the place where Matthew and Mark have them. This, however, amounts to no more than a possible conjecture. The motive for the change or the insertion is clear enough. In all probability, we do better to hold by the text of Mark x., 32 *ff.*, and Matthew xx., 17 *ff.*

But it may be more profitable to discuss the significance of these words after we have reviewed the other

passages in Luke which are of the same character and import.

In Luke xxi., 22, we have: "For these are days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled" (*πλησθηναι*). This is peculiar to Luke and is in a section peculiar to this Gospel. The whole section is confusing, containing doublets and parallels.

There are numerous passages in the Old Testament to which "all things which are written" might refer. This whole section in Luke bears clear marks of a later working over. Jesus' words have been here recorded in the light of what afterward really occurred. Notice, for example, Luke's departure from his parallels in Luke xxi., 20. Just following, in verse 24, we have the phrase: "Until the times of the Gentiles *be fulfilled*" (*πληρωθωσιν*). This is peculiar to Luke and has generally been considered as a parenthetical explanatory addition by the writer. The meaning is by no means clear.<sup>1</sup>

These three passages, Luke xviii., 31, xxi., 22, and xxi., 24, are so vague, general, and indefinite that they form no basis for any certain judgment, either as to the writer's view or of that of Jesus, if he uttered them.

But there are further passages, all contained in the twenty-fourth chapter, which are somewhat more explicit: Luke xxiv., 25-27; Luke xxiv., 44-47. These belong in a portion of the Gospel entirely peculiar to Luke. We are on very uncertain ground here. Note the general and indefinite nature of the account.

Luke xxiv., 25-27: "And he said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behoved it not the Christ to

<sup>1</sup> Compare Tobit xiv., 5.

suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

Luke xxiv., 44-47: "And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must be fulfilled ( $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta\rho\alpha\iota$  and not as elsewhere in Luke  $\tau\varepsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\rho\alpha\iota$ ), which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem."

The difficulties in any discussion of material contained in this chapter are many. The philosophical and psychological difficulty is great. Was the resurrection a spiritual resurrection, as Paul declares it was? Then much in this account in Luke must be set aside. Was Christ's a "spiritual body"? Spiritual bodies do not eat of fish. Nor do they consist of "flesh and bones."

A study of Luke's Gospel indicates one mark, namely—in certain cases the event has been recorded in the light of later doctrines and events.<sup>1</sup> We have here an evident attempt to ground the later exegesis and interpretation in the example of Jesus himself.

Any one who makes a careful study of the "post-resurrection" accounts will feel that they cannot be

<sup>1</sup> In the first chapter we have poetic material in which later events are carried forward. The case of change in Luke xxi., 20, illustrates this writing of history in view of later happenings.

used as any basis for a discussion of the teachings of Jesus. They reflect the later consciousness of the Church and contain its conceptions.

But even if we consider these passages as historical and genuine, they do not give us much information. They simply tell us that Jesus told them that his life and especially his death were in conformity to the requirements of Scripture. To suppose that he here took a different view of the matter from that which we find in his actual use of prophecy, is entirely gratuitous. There is nothing here that tells us of any literal predictions in prophecy regarding himself. We certainly cannot use these vague and indefinite suggestions as any basis for our Lord's view of the relation of himself to the Old Testament Scriptures.

Moreover, in view of the fact that both of these series of texts are so isolated from the general view and interest of the writer of this Gospel, we are inclined to consider them, in the main, as later parenthetical explanatory insertions.

In Luke, then, we have no doctrine, such as we have in Matthew and John, regarding the relation of Jesus to prophecy. The writer had no interest in the question whatever.

#### *The Fourth Gospel*

The writer of the Gospel according to John shows considerable concern to find literal parallelisms between the events of Jesus' life and Old Testament prophecies which he takes as predictions. His point of view seems to be identical with that of the writer of the first Gospel. He does not follow Matthew, however, but chooses his own material. Only in one or two cases does he hit upon the same passage as the writer of Matthew.

Let us glance at a few of his interpretations of prophecy.

In recounting the conversation between Philip and Nathaniel (John i., 45), he represents Philip as declaring with considerable explicitness: "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Here, of course, there is only a very general statement, but it indicates the point of view. In ii., 17, at the occasion of the temple-cleansing, he informs his readers that "the disciples" remembered that it was written: "Zeal for thy house shall eat me up." (Psalm 1xix., 9.)

Like Matthew, this Gospel tells us in reference to Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, that it occurred "as it is written" in Zechariah ix., 9. Similarly, in John xii., 38, the people believed not in Jesus, though he had done so many signs before them, "that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled." Indeed, he becomes more direct, literal, and explicit, for he adds: "These things said Isaiah, because he saw his glory; *and he spake of him.*"

A most marked piece of literalism occurs in John xiii., 18. Jesus even chose Judas, knowing when he chose him that he was to be a traitor. And Jesus purposely made this choice, so this writer tells us, in order to fulfil a verse in Psalms xli., 9. This is evidently an interpolation or else a parenthetical explanation. It so disturbs the literary connection, when considered parenthetically, as to lead us to conclude that it is rather an interpolation. In any case it shows us the point of view which ruled either the original writer or a later editor of this Gospel. It is a classic piece of literalism.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the discussion of this passage in Chapter II., "A Significant Interpolation."

In John xv., 25, we have another explanatory insertion of a similar character: "But that the word may be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause."<sup>1</sup> Again this writer has inserted another explanatory or modifying clause which actually, as it reads, distorts and destroys the effect of a prayer of our Lord. What a mechanical type of literalism it is that leads one to insert such a phrase as this in a prayer of our Lord: "And not one of them perished, but the son of perdition; *that the scripture might be fulfilled.*"

In John xix., 24, when the soldiers cast lots regarding the disposition of Jesus' garment, the natural explanation which they themselves give is, that it seemed unwise to rend it; but this writer declares that it was done "that the scripture might be fulfilled" as written in Psalm xxii., 18 (19).

Jesus, in agony on the cross, says, "I thirst," not because of natural suffering; and they gave him to drink, not in this case simply because this was the uniform custom. The writer discards these apparent and sufficient reasons and seriously avers that Jesus cried "I thirst" and in response was given this natural drink, mainly at least, "that the scripture might be accomplished" according to Psalm lxix., 21. In the same account "they brake not his legs" and "with a spear pierced his side," and "these things came to pass, that the scripture might be fulfilled," referring to Psalm xxxiv., 20, and Zechariah xii., 10. The disciples were in amazement at the empty tomb, only because "they knew not the scripture."

We get other glimpses of this narrator's conception

<sup>1</sup> See the discussion of this passage in Chapter II., "A Passage which Shows how Jesus did not Use Scripture."

in instances where he interprets Jesus' words as literal predictions, although the words as uttered by Jesus manifestly had no such meaning. For example, in John xii., 32, Jesus says: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Jesus, of course, uses the figure to declare a spiritual truth, and his hearers so understood it. But this writer makes it the prediction of a physical event, "signifying what manner of death he should die." In xviii., 9, he explains the request of Jesus that his captors "let these go their way," as a fulfilment of Jesus' own words spoken just before: "Of those whom thou hast given me I lost not one." Here is another case where Jesus uses words in a highly spiritual sense and this writer drags them down to depths of literalism, even to the extent of representing Jesus as taking an action in order to fulfil his own prediction of it.

Again, the Jews refuse to dispose of Jesus themselves. They say they refuse because it is against their law to do so. And this was true. But the writer sees a deeper reason and rejects this one. They refuse to do it "that the word of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying by what manner of death he should die." (John xviii., 32.)

In ii., 21, he entirely misinterprets Jesus' declaration regarding the rebuilding of the temple. It is clear enough that Jesus means to say: Destroy this Jewish hierarchy and in a few brief days I will replace it by the structure founded upon my truth. But again the writer discards or fails to see this lofty spiritual significance of our Lord's words; and seriously tells us that "he spake of the temple of his body."

There are, in this Gospel, several telltale evidences of the causes that pushed the writer and the early

preachers to this type of interpretation. A large class of men demanded that if Jesus be proved Messiah, it must be done by means of the rabbinical proof which was current in that age. In ii., 22, the disciples "believed" in both Jesus and the Scripture through this means of proof.

In these last instances, in seeing the difference between the real meaning of Jesus' words, and the wrong interpretation given by the writer of John, we see the difference between Jesus and this writer on the question we are discussing.

Indeed, we get information from this Gospel which proves that Jesus never was in the habit of using this kind of proof. From John xx., 9, it is evident that Jesus, in declaring his resurrection, had not used Old Testament prediction to fortify his words, for this passage distinctly tells us that "as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise from the dead." He frequently says "*then* they remembered" certain Scripture references. It is evident enough from this Gospel that Jesus had not trained his disciples in this thing nor set them any example.

The principal contrast between our Lord's use of prophecy, and that of writers like those of the first and fourth Gospels, lies in the fact that here was a realm which had no existence for him, and which they entered into on no authority from him.

#### *Some Further Comparisons*

We find, throughout the remainder of the New Testament, much of the same use of prophecy that we have found to be characteristic of the writers of the first and fourth Gospels. In the speech of Stephen, recorded in Acts vii., 2-53, we see clearly reflected the

method employed to prove the Messiahship of Jesus. Stephen recounts the whole history of Israel as leading up to Jesus Christ. The Old Testament personages, particularly the prophets, are referred to as "them that showed before of the coming of the Righteous One." Acts vii., 37, in which passage Stephen, speaking of Moses, says: "This is that Moses, who said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me," indicates the prevailing conception of the relationship between prophecy and Christ.

The requirements of the age created the early Christian apologetic. This led to its hermeneutics. The Apostles were called upon to prove their statements that Jesus was the Messiah; and that proof must come in a specific and detailed way from the Scriptures. At first, a crucified Messiah was an offence to the congregations of the Apostles. This offence must be removed. This was done, first of all, by presenting the fact of his resurrection. This was a vindication of his crucifixion. But the resurrection itself must be a consequence of scriptural prediction in order to have value. Thus we find the burden of Paul's preaching to be that Jesus must die "according to the scriptures"; and that he must rise the third day "according to the scriptures." (1 Cor. xv., 3 *ff.*) In Peter's pentecostal speech (Acts ii., 14 *ff.*), the speaking with tongues is defended as being a fulfilment of Joel. (Joel ii., 28-32.) Peter proves the resurrection of the crucified Messiah from what "David saith concerning him" in the sixteenth Psalm. (Acts ii., 25 *ff.*) Again, in the temple speech (Acts iii., 1 *ff.*), Christ is the true prophet predicted by Moses and the prophets.

It will be of interest to glance at some further ex-

amples which will indicate the main purpose for which the Apostles and disciples used prophecy in the preaching of the Gospel. They made little if any distinction between "the prophets" and the other portions of the Old Testament in their considerations concerning prediction. So we shall include references contained in other than prophetic books.

Philip finds in Isaiah liii., 7, 8, a text for the preaching of Jesus to the eunuch. (Acts viii., 32.) Paul uses Psalm ii., 7, to prove that Jesus is God's son raised up in accordance with promise. (Acts xiii., 33.) Peter regards him as the seed in whom the old covenant is fulfilled. (Acts iii., 26.) He finds a prediction of Jesus as a prophet in collations from Deuteronomy xviii., 15-19, and Leviticus xxiii., 29.

But not only does the life of Christ come within the prophetic perspective. It is projected upon the background of the ages, which are full of events in symmetrical relation to the central figure. According to Peter's view, the death of the betrayer is predicted by Psalm lxix., 25, and it happened as it did because the Scripture must be fulfilled. The Holy Spirit had spoken "by the mouth of David *concerning Judas.*" (Acts i., 16 *ff.*) Matthias is elected to succeed Judas on the authority of Psalm cix., 8.

The arrangement regarding the Gentiles was accepted because "to this agree the words of the prophets," in Amos ix., 11 and 12. (Acts xv., 15.) Selections like these, which we have taken at random from the narrative in the Book of Acts, show that, to these preachers, prophecy as detailed prediction was the key to their Christology. Every great fact and some small ones, every great movement, was clearly, specifically, and particularly set forth as prediction in Scripture. In

the Epistles, typical and allegorical exegesis is used with a free hand.

A consideration of the Apocryphal books reveals the same thing. While the particularism of the Wisdom of Solomon shows a certain advance, it yet contains a good deal of this unethical use of Scripture. Such examples of Old Testament exegesis and application as we find in Tobit ii., 6, and the reference to the prophet Jonah in Tobit xiv., 4, which come to mind, indicate the prevailing point of view.

We have a somewhat striking example of the freedom with which all this application was made in Matthew iii., 13, in the Gospel of the Hebrews where the baptism of Jesus is related to the second Psalm in a Messianic sense. The later writers were forced to the same methods, a significant example being found in Ignatius. The use of prophecy by the Church Fathers was largely allegorical and typical.<sup>1</sup>

With the Evangelists and Apostles the impression of Christ's person went beyond that of his teaching. Their mission was to present Christ as the Messiah. While this needed no proof to them, they were obliged to prove it to others. That proof could consist in nothing but the evidence that prophecy as prediction was fulfilled in Jesus. In carrying out this proof, the content of his thought was sometimes overlooked, and the likeness of his life and work to the predictions in prophecy were emphasized at the expense of the differences. In fact, they did their work so effectually in this respect, that the later Rabbis were led to invent a second Messiah, a suffering one, which had not existed in the mind of pre-Christian Judaism.

<sup>1</sup>See Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, page 189 ff.

The apostolic writers and the Fathers seem to have made little or no distinction between different parts of the Old Testament in the prefiguring of Christ. Moses and Joshua were typical of him. Jonah, in the belly of the great fish, typified Jesus in the tomb; the brazen serpent, Jesus crucified. When Paul appeals to Christ as buried and rising the third day, he appeals to the Jonah passage. Later on, Noah floating in the ark was a prefiguration of the Church guided by Christ. The prophets had foretold all the details of Christ's life and work. There is no doubt that this shaped to some extent the story of Jesus' life, while it was in its oral and early written, floating form. Events were moulded, and prophecy itself misconstrued to make the harmony. This is plainly apparent in the accounts of Jesus' work. An example of the tampering that was done with prophecy is found in the addition in a manuscript of the words "from the Cross" to Psalm xcvi., 10, which reads, "Say among the nations, Jahwe reigneth." This was done by a Christian writer in the second century, and we find the text quoted in this way by subsequent writers.

We ought to call attention to the fact that while these writers treated Scripture in this way, this was not the only use they made of it. Side by side with this, we have such spiritual exegesis as that of Paul, for example, in the last of Acts. The literalizing method, while general and almost universal, did find its objectors in the early history of Christianity. Such were the Manicheans. In a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew which was discovered not long ago, in which this was the subject, the Jew asks, when told that Isaiah vii., 17, prefigures the coming and offerings of the Magi, "Why, if the Christ whom you speak of was

really to sojourn among us, did not the prophets say clearly that it was to be so? For, as it is, you bring me testimonies picked up here, there, and everywhere, now out of one prophet, now out of another, now out of a third. Could not any one of these say right out and plainly that the Wisdom of God was to be made flesh, and to suffer this and do that?" Listen to the objections of Faustus, the Manichean, who strove with Augustine on this:

"You ask me, Why do you not accept the prophets? Rather do you tell me, if you can, a reason why we should do so. 'Because,' you answer, 'of the predictions in which they bore witness to Christ.' To be frank, I have not found any such; although I have read them with the utmost care and attention . . . I should say, it has already been proved to excess, in the books of our predecessors, that your prophets did not utter a single prediction of Christ."<sup>1</sup>

While we do not agree with Faustus in regard to all his grounds, he yet expresses the doubt that has come to many thoughtful Christian scholars since his day. It is true, as Conybeare says, that Faustus "overshoots the mark." "There is a great deal in the Prophets and Psalms in the Old Testament without which Christianity would be much poorer." But our concern is neither to attack nor to defend the early use of prophecy.

At all events, whatever may be the value of any literal correspondences that can be found between Christ and the Old Testament, the significant thing which we would bring out is that in our discussion of Christ's use of prophecy it is clear that this was not his interest. While he believed himself to be the Messiah and his

<sup>1</sup>See, "The Place of Prophecy in Christianity," F. C. Conybeare, *The New World*, March, 1898.

disciples received this conviction from him, their method of proof was not one suggested by Jesus, but one which was forced upon them by the influences of their age. The contrast which we find between Jesus and all these writers indicates his elevation above his age, his superiority in spiritual insight. As we have previously suggested, the Gospel writers themselves show that Jesus himself did not use prophecy in this way. For again and again they call attention to the fact that "as yet they knew not the scripture." They tell us that they did not discover all these predictions until after his death. "Then they remembered" this and that passage. Let us take one instance which will indicate the difference between our Lord's method and point of view, and those of his later apologists. When the hearers of the latter ask, How can this be the Christ? they are met with the answer, Because thus he is declared in Scripture. This is the final appeal.

But when, again and again, Jesus' hearers asked this question, his reply is not a piling up of Old Testament predictions. When "the Jews therefore came round him, and said unto him, How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly; Jesus answered them, I told you and ye believe not; the *works* that I do in my Father's name, these bear witness of me." (John x., 24, 25.) When they ask for a "sign" (John vi., 30), he gives them, not an Old Testament prediction, he gives them himself. He declares that he is his own proof.

Laying aside, then, the question as to whether the later writers were right or wrong,<sup>1</sup> the fact remains

<sup>1</sup> Schürer remarks: "The Apostles and Christian authors in general were preserved from the extravagances of Jewish exegesis by the regulative norm of the Gospel. And yet who

that, in the use of Old Testament prophecy and in the main conception of its significance and value, there is a world of contrast between our Lord and Philo, Rabbis, Evangelists, Apostles, and Fathers, his estimate of prophecy containing nothing of that element which they made fundamental.

would now justify such treatment of Old Testament passages as is found, *e. g.*, in Galatians iii., 16, iv., 22-25; Romans x., 6-8; Matthew xxii., 31, 32? "*The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 2d Div. 1, page 349.

## CHAPTER VIII

### JESUS' VIEW OF HIS BIBLE

OUR discussion of Jesus' use of prophecy suggests another and a larger question. The Old Testament was Jesus' Bible. How did he, as a whole, estimate it? At the risk of some repetition, we shall now seek to suggest the broader significance of the results to which our discussion points. We have seen that Jesus evidently placed a high estimate on his Bible. This is not indicated so much by what he says about its authority as by the fact that he lived and breathed in these Scriptures. He gives us no defined theory of inspiration. One thing seems certain. All Scriptures did not have the same value to him, for we have seen that his predilection was for the prophetic writers. We have seen the naturalness of this. It was largely due to the fact that he found many points of contact between himself and the prophets, with regard to his life and experience, and with relation to his thought and teaching. His chief use of prophecy was for homiletic purposes. For him it was primarily of value as truth and not as prediction. Its value rested on its spiritual character. He does not regard its authority as of such a nature as to preclude him from diverging, in his teaching, from the teaching of the prophets. He evidently realizes that they have not spoken all the truth

that could be spoken. He goes beyond the prophetic view.

We see, for example, that Jesus' conceptions of the benefits and blessings of the Kingdom of God have a far less material, and an infinitely more spiritual character than those of the prophets in general. There is a difference in his view of the nature of the Kingdom. His conception of God, while not inharmonious with the prophetic conception, went far beyond it. It is clear that Jesus recognized that the revelation of God in the prophets was not in perfect form. It is right at this point that we see his clear, spiritual discernment. He distinguished between the historic form and the ideal. The real significance of the prophets lay in the latter. Thus he could connect his teaching with the prophetic, and make the latter his starting-point. The law of connection was that of inner idea and purpose. Thus did they desire to see the things which the disciples saw. In hope and faith, even the patriarchs had rejoiced in him.

The point of contact being thus ethical and spiritual, he is freed from any slavish dependence in his use of prophetic passages. Evidently prophecy did not all have equal value for him. We saw that he chose prophecy out of Scripture. So also he chose prophecy out of prophecy. Wide tracts of it had no existence for him, because they were inferior in spiritual content to others. He clearly distinguished between the kernel and the husk, between the human and the divine element. Wherever we find him adopting the terms of prophecy, he transforms and spiritualizes them. We saw this in his use of such terms as Son of Man and Kingdom of God. Especially does all this appear in his Messianic conception. Wherever he accommodates

himself to the language of the prophets this is the case. As Colani says, "*à la fois, il spiritualise et il s'accomode.*"

We have seen that in doing this he rose above the influences of his age. We find nothing of that letter-worship, that subtle comparison and literalistic pedantic correspondence which characterized the Rabbis, and by which the Evangelists and apostolic writers allowed themselves to be influenced. We see that his idea of fulfilment was something very different from theirs; something infinitely more spiritual and significant. It may be answered that there are some passages of Jesus' sayings which are capable of a different interpretation from that given in the preceding chapters. What should be our standard of choice? We answer, The mind of Christ. Finding all this to be the general attitude of Jesus, we must interpret those passages where another meaning *might be possible*, in the light of our Lord's general view. We must not decide the general by the particular.

In discussing such a passage, for instance, as Mark xii., 10, 11, Gould remarks:

"the question whether Jesus used the passage according to a common view of his time as directly Messianic, or only as a statement of . . . principle, depends on our view of him. It seems to be a rational inference, from what we know of Jesus, that he had derived his idea of the Messianic office partly from the Old Testament, and that idea is possible only with a rational treatment of the Old Testament, while the current view of his time would be derived from a literalistic and irrational treatment of it. And, in general, we know that he so far transcended his age as to take a spiritual view of the Old Testament, and there is no reason to suppose that this would not include the rational treatment of a passage like this. That is, Jesus would see in it, not a direct reference to himself, but only the statement of a principle applicable to himself."

Wherever Jesus in any way applies prophecy to himself (and such instances are very few) this is the nature of his application.

Among other significant indications of Jesus' view of the Scriptures is the fact that while he held them in deep reverence, he makes no effort at all to show that his teaching was in accord with "them of old time" as the basis for his authority. He himself was greater than the Scriptures. He reproaches the Jews because, in their punctilious search of the Scriptures, they were so occupied that they passed him by, and would not come unto him that they might have life. He did not hesitate, both directly and indirectly, to indicate divergence of his teaching from that of Scripture (Matthew v., 21 *ff.*). Evidently, then, he did not consider it either a perfect, complete, or errorless revelation of God. Scripture, we have already seen, was not all one and the same thing to him. He freely chooses what he wants and, as one writer has said, "what was not homogeneous slipped off." Only by regarding this as his attitude can we reconcile his open divergence from much that Scripture contains, with the fact that, at the same time, he can appeal to the Old Testament. He can thus diverge on the basis of a discrimination between certain parts of Scripture; and, in other cases, a discrimination between the real vital principles in Scripture and that which is formal and local. He could break with the form of the revelation, while he held to its truth. He could select the truth from the error.

As almost everywhere else, Jesus is here a Jew, and yet more than a Jew. He is with his time, and yet above his time. His attitude toward the Old Testament is much like his general attitude toward Judaism. While he did not take a revolutionary and destructive

attitude towards either, he did towards their errors and perversions. "In the deepest sense he claims, not to destroy, but to fulfil them. Yet how free is his handling of those very commandments, notwithstanding their historic sacredness. He reserves to himself the title of pronouncing what their essential meaning is, of translating them from the imperfection of the letter into the fulness of the divine intention. It is he who decides what shall disappear and what remain. He endorses, modifies, abrogates, and yet at the same time insists that the principles which he lays down cannot in their turn be abrogated. He is never confused or uncertain amid all the multiplicity of details in the Jewish law; each falls into its place, and he passes judgment on it with the accent of absolute assurance, 'Verily I say unto you.'"<sup>1</sup>

A study of Christ's use of the Scriptures is in itself a commentary on the Scriptures. As Meinhold has well said: "Wir sehen nicht in Jesu den Heiland, weil er der Messias des Alten Testaments ist. Denn wir haben nicht Jesum durch das Alte Testament sondern vielmehr das Alte Testament durch Jesum."<sup>2</sup>

The question is raised to-day on every hand, What is the nature and extent of the authority and inspiration of these same Scriptures? What is the significance of the results to which we have come in our discussion, with relation to this vital question? How are we to view and use the Scriptures? We can unhesitatingly answer: Not altogether as the Church has viewed them; not altogether as the early Fathers viewed and used them; no, not even altogether as the apostolic writers used them. We must go back of the authority

<sup>1</sup> See Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, page 46.

<sup>2</sup> Meinhold, *Jesus und das A. T.*

of the disciple to the authority of the Teacher himself. We are to view and use the Bible as Jesus did. Clearly, Jesus was not troubled by the fact that he found things in the Scriptures which were imperfect. Clearly, he did not deem its writers infallible. Certainly, he distinguished between the divine revelation and its human form and media. It would seem that he recognized no doctrine of absolute and literal inerrancy. He could set his, "Verily, I say unto you," directly over against the words of "them of old time." He recognized that Moses had given laws which were not applicable to all generations. On the other hand, we find him uttering his sternest rebukes against a literalizing and undiscriminating use of Scripture. The bearing of all this on those methods of biblical study which a portion of the Christian Church unfortunately sets its face against is of the greatest significance.<sup>1</sup>

The discussion of our Lord's use of prophecy has led the writer to many view-points from which to survey the general attitude of Jesus towards his Bible. And the inevitable conclusion is that, both in precept and in example, we have Jesus' authority for the denial of any theory of equal value to every part. He himself was not bound by scriptural utterances and felt free to diverge from them. He recognized that much of scriptural teaching could be and must be improved upon.

<sup>1</sup> "Wir stellen uns mit vollem Bewusstsein auf den Standpunkt, dass das Christentum mit der äusseren Stellung Jesu zum Alten Testamente durchaus nicht steht und fällt; dass, wo sie mit der inneren in Streit kommt, dieser durchaus der Vorzug zu geben ist, und behaupten, dass die neuere Forschung auf dem Gebiete des Alten Testamentes hier in ungesuchter Weise Christi Auffassung auf das glänzendste bestätigt, nicht aber irgendwie schädigt."—*Jesus und das A. T.*, page 109, "Jesus innere Stellung zum A. T."

Some of it, in the form in which we have it, must be discarded for higher teaching. We have no warrant for any theory of so-called plenary inspiration, either from the teachings or from the example of Jesus. And can any one doubt that our Lord would bequeath to his disciples the same intellectual freedom that he claimed and exercised for himself? He has not decided these questions in detail for us. He has set us an example. And that example was a discriminating use of the written word.

The careful study of such a theme forces the conclusion upon us that we must avoid an indiscriminate acceptance of the interpretations of the teachings of our Lord presented by those who have transmitted to us the doctrines of succeeding ages. We cannot always rest upon the explanations of the Gospel writers who have preserved for us this priceless teaching. We must go back of Church Fathers, back of the Apostles and the Evangelists, back of all fallible interpreters, to the words of Jesus themselves. And we must interpret them for ourselves. The teachings of the Master must be distinguished from the rest of Scripture with which they are mingled and must be assigned an authority of their own. These words of Jesus must mould our doctrines. Our transmitted doctrines must not be permitted to mould these teachings. We must take care not to substitute commandments and traditions of men for the divine utterances of our Lord and Master. As Dr. Stalker has aptly put it, "Jesus is the best teacher of his own religion."

Does this conclusion involve some depreciation of the Gospel writers? To the minds of some it does, in a serious way. Hence the painful and disastrous attempts to harmonize inharmonious things. To the

mind of the writer of this book, it does not involve any serious depreciation. But suppose, for a moment, that it did. Behold, a greater than the Apostles, a greater than the Evangelists, a greater than the four Gospels is here!

To gain the view and the interpretation of the writers of the Gospels is not enough. The unceasing effort of the human mind, and its loftiest endeavor, is to gain, first, the vision of the Christ which they beheld only in a measure, then, through him, to recover the unutterable vision, of him "who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Schürer—*The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.*  
Edersheim—*The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*  
Forrest—*The Christ of History and of Experience.*  
Renan—*Vie de Jésus.*  
Weizsäcker—*The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.*  
McGiffert—*The Apostolic Age.*  
Cone—*Gospel Criticism and Historic Christianity.*  
Carpenter—*The First Three Gospels.*  
Wendt—*Die Lehre Jesu (Erster Theil).*  
“ *The Teaching of Jesus.*  
Stevens—*The Johannine Theology.*  
Jülicher—*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu.*  
Bruce—*The Parabolic Teaching of Jesus.*  
Briggs—*Messianic Prophecy.*  
Riehm—*Messianic Prophecy.*  
Stanton—*The Jewish and the Christian Messiah.*  
Colani—*Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de Son Temps.*  
Edersheim—*Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah.*  
Hühn—*Die messianische Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim (I. Teil).*  
Hühn—*Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im N. T. (II. Teil).*  
Briggs—*The Messiah of the Gospels.*  
Schwartzkopff—*Die Gottesoffenbarung in Jesu Christo.*  
“ *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi u. s. w.*  
Baldensperger—*Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu.*  
Schürer—*Die Predigt Jesu Christi in ihrem Verhältnisse zum Alten Testamente und zum Judentum.*  
Bousset—*Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum.*  
Meinhold—*Jesus und das A. T.*

Kähler—*Jesus und das A. T.*

Clemen—*Der Gebrauch des Alten Testamento in den neutestamentlichen Schriften.*

Franke—*Das A. T. bei Johannes.*

Toy—*Quotations in the New Testament.*

Johnson—*The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old.*

Tholuck—*Das A. T. im N. T.*

Dalman—*Die Worte Jesu mit berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüd. Schrifthums und der aramäischen Sprache.*

Wrede—*Das Messias-geheimnis.*

Drummond, J.—*Philo Judæus.*

Yonge—*The Works of Philo Judæus.*

Siegfried—*Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testamento.*

Schmidt—“Was נָשָׁן בָּר a Messianic Title?” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xv., 1896, Pts. 1 and 2, page 36 ff.

Peters—“Christ’s Treatment of the Old Testament. (*Ibid.*, page 87 ff.)

Conybeare—“The Place of Prophecy in Christianity.” *The New World*, March, 1898.

## TEXTS

Baer and Delitzsch—Hebrew Bible.

Swete—*The O. T. in Greek.*

Ed. D. E. Nestle—*Novum Testamentum Græce.*

Tischendorf—*Novum Testamentum Græce.*

Westcott and Hort—*The New Testament in Greek.*

Bruce and Dods—*The Expositors’ Greek Testament.*

Westcott and Hort—*Introduction to the New Testament in Greek.*

Ed. Lee—*Novum Testamentum Syriacum.*

Bensly, Harris, and Burkitt—*Evangelium Syriace—E Codice Sinaitico.*

Wright—*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek.*

Huck—*Synopse.*

Stevens and Burton—*A Harmony of the Gospels for Historical Study.*

## GENERAL INDEX

Acts, Prophecy in the Book of, 227 *ff.*

Apocalyptic Discourses of Jesus, the, 144 *ff.*

Beatitudes, the, 137 *ff.*

Betrayal of Jesus, the, 105 *ff.*

Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, 101.

Briggs, on Messianic Prophecy, 8, 58 *ff.*, 82, 83, 91 *ff.*

Carpenter, J. Estlin, on the Gospels, 52.

Christianity and Judaism, 5.

Clemen, on Prophecy, 67.

Colani, on Messianic Prophecy, 50.

Cone, Gospel Criticism, 111.

Cross, Jesus' Cry on the, 140.,

Dalman, on the Sayings of Jesus, 163.

Daniel, Jesus' Use of, 143 *ff.*

Davidic Descent of Jesus, the, 43 *ff.*, 47 *ff.*, 50.

Disagreements, an Example of Gospel, 107.

Displacements in the Gospels, 71 *ff.*, 79.

Edersheim, on Messianic Prophecy, 68, 171.

Editorial Work in the Gospels, 62.

Elijah and John the Baptist, 63 *ff.*, 68.

Epistles, Prophecy in the, 227 *ff.*

*Evangelists, The* :  
Contrasted with Jesus, 233.  
Relations between, 115, 116, 119.  
Renderings of, 116.  
Sources of Citations by, 113.  
Subjective Tendencies of, 8 *ff.*, 61 *ff.*, 81, 89, 94, 95.  
Use of Prophecy by, 93, 124, 230.  
Variations in the Narratives of, 119, 124, 145, 180 Note.

Formulas Introducing Quotations, 121 *ff.*

Fulfilment, 91, 94, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 165 *ff.*, 195, 198 *ff.*, 202.

Fulfilment, Idea of, in the Fourth Gospel, 103, 108, 110, 111, 112.

Gospels, the :  
Credibility of, 128.  
Sources of, 9.

Gould, Commentary on Mark, 237.

Hellenistic-Jewish Literature, 211 *ff.*

Holtzmann, Commentaries, 35, 64, 73, 176.

Hühn, on Messianic Prophecy, 8, 199.

Inspiration of the Scriptures, Jesus' View on the, 235 *ff.*, 239, 240, 241.

Interpolations and Insertions in the Gospels, 97 Note, 107, 111, 112, 145, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175.

Jerusalem, the Destruction of, 133 ff., 145.

*Jesus* :

- An intellectual Estimate of, 1 ff.
- Authority of, the, Chapter I., 239.
- Biblical Criticism, his Relation to, 47.
- Contrasted with the Evangelists on Prophecy, 233.
- Daniel, His Use of, 143 ff., 152.
- Davidic Descent of, 43, 47 ff., 50.
- Development, His Theory of, 17.
- Fulfilment, His Idea of, 123 ff., 127, 198 ff., 202.
- God's Grace, His View of, 80 ff., 178.
- Inspiration, His Idea of, 235.
- John the Baptist, His Connection with, 180, 182.
- Judaism, His Relation to, 4, 183.
- Judas, His Relation to, 104 ff.
- Kingdom of God, His Idea of, 148 ff., 209.
- Law, His Attitude to the, 166 ff., 202.
- Messianic Idea of, 181, 197 ff., 209.
- Prophecy and the Prophets, His Relation to, 107, 136, 179, 186, 188, 190 ff., 192, 194, 195.
- Rabbis, Contrasted with the, 46, 48, 50, 63, 68.
- Ritual, His View of the, 184, 186.
- Sayings of, the Recently Discovered, 80.

*Scripture* :

His Estimate of, 4.  
His Intimacy with, 99.  
His Use of, 6, 153, 157, 193, 209, 212.

Second Coming of, 151.

Son of God, the, 101 ff.

Supper, the Last, of, 103, 105 ff.

Universalism, His Doctrine of, 184, 185.

John the Baptist, 63 ff., 68, 180, 182.

*John, the Gospel of* :

Composition of, 104, 111.

Disagreement with Synoptists, 107.

Fulfilment, its Idea of, 103, 108, 110, 111, 112, 223 ff.

Interpolations in, 107, 111, 112.

Language of, 135.

Nature of, 10.

Peculiarities of, 96, 107.

Prophecy, Its Use of, 223 ff.

Texts of, 118.

Jonah, the Sign of, 12, 174.

Judaism and Christianity, 5.

Judas and Jesus, 104 ff.

Jülicher, on the Parables, 17, 32, 33.

Kingdom of God, 158 ff., 209.

Jesus' Idea of, 148 ff.

Kingdom of Heaven, the, 158 ff.

Last Supper, the, 103 ff.

Law, the, 109.

Jesus' Attitude towards, 166 ff., 202.

*Logia*, the, 89, 114.

Lord's Prayer, the, 133.

*Luke, the Gospel of* :

Composition of, 9.

Insertions, examples of, 172.

Prophecy, its Use of, 218 ff.

Texts of, 118.

Manicheans, on Prophecy, 231 *ff.*

*Mark, the Gospel of:*  
Composition of, 9.  
Insertions, examples of, 171.  
Prophecy, its Use of, 218 *ff.*  
Source, as a, 114.  
Texts of, 118.

*Matthew, the Gospel of:*  
Composition of, 9.  
Insertions and Expansions in, 38, 41, 42, 65, 145, 170, 173, 175.  
Prophecy, its Use of, 214 *ff.*  
Texts of, 117.

Meinholt, on Prophecy, 240.

*Messiah, the:*  
Jesus' Idea of, 181, 197 *ff.*, 209.  
In Prophecy, 195 *ff.*

Mustard Seed, Parable of the, 15.

*Old Testament, the:*  
Jesus in the, 202.  
Sources of Texts, 113 *ff.*, 115.

Palestinian-Jewish Literature, 204 *ff.*

*Parables, the:*  
Mustard Seed, the, 15.  
Sower, the, 23.  
Unworthy Husbandmen, the, 30.

Passion Accounts, the, 140.

Peter, the Gospel of, 141.

Philo, 211 *ff.*

*Prophecy:*  
Evangelists in the Use of, 25.  
Messianic Idea in, 195, 196.  
Nature of, 7, 194 *ff.*  
Typical Use of, 110.

Psalms, the Messianic, 103.

Quotations, Composite, 27.

Rabbis, Interpretations of the, 204 *ff.*

Renan, *Life of Jesus*, 6, 51.

*Resurrection, the:*  
Gospel Accounts of, 140.  
In the Old Testament, 92.  
Post-Resurrection Narratives, 222.

Riehm, on Messianic Prophecy, 8.

Sayings of Jesus, the Newly Discovered, 80.

Schürer, *The Jewish People*, 67, 233.

Septuagint, the Influence of the, 125.

Servant of Jehovah, the, 76, 90, 91, 93.

Sinaitic Palimpsest, the, 37, 44.

Smith, George Adam, Commentaries, 58, 59, 67, 77, 86, 92.

Son of God, the, 102, 153.

Son of Man, the, 87, 154 *ff.*

Stanton, on Messianic Prophecy, 52, 155.

Stevens, George B.:  
*The Johannine Theology*, 98, 111.  
*The Theology of the New Testament*, 150.

Synoptic Problem, the, 9 *ff.*

Toy, on New Testament Quotations, 66, 75, 98.

Typical Use of Prophecy, the, 110.

Variations in the Gospels, some examples of, 119, 145, 180.

Weiss, *New Testament Theology*, 25.

Wellhausen, 59.

Wendt, on the Teaching of Jesus, 25, 49, 64, 80.

INDEX OF THE MAIN TEXTS REFERRED TO  
THE NEW TESTAMENT

Mark	PAGE	Matthew— <i>Continued</i>	PAGE
1: 2 . . . . .	63	11: 10 . . . . .	63
3: 26 . . . . .	91	11: 23 . . . . .	68
4: 12 . . . . .	18	12: 7 . . . . .	70
4: 30-32 . . . . .	15	12: 38-42 . . . . .	174
7: 1-13 . . . . .	4	12: 39, 40 . . . . .	12
7: 6, 7 . . . . .	54	13: 13-15 . . . . .	18
8: 18 . . . . .	18	13: 31, 32 . . . . .	16
9: 12 . . . . .	170	13: 32 . . . . .	15
9: 48 . . . . .	61	15: 8, 9 . . . . .	8, 54
11: 17 . . . . .	25	21: 1-11 . . . . .	172
12: 2 . . . . .	29	21: 13, 14 . . . . .	25
12: 10, 11 . . . . .	39	21: 33 . . . . .	29
12: 36, 37 . . . . .	43	21: 42 . . . . .	5, 39
13: 12 . . . . .	51	21: 44 . . . . .	84, 85
13: 14 . . . . .	144 <i>ff.</i>	22: 14 . . . . .	35
13: 19 . . . . .	146	22: 43-45 . . . . .	43
13: 24 . . . . .	146	24: 15 . . . . .	144 <i>ff.</i>
13: 26 . . . . .	147	24: 21 . . . . .	146
14: 18 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	106	24: 29 . . . . .	146
14: 21 . . . . .	171	24: 30 . . . . .	147
14: 27 . . . . .	57	26: 21 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	106
14: 49 . . . . .	89, 170	26: 31 . . . . .	57
14: 62 . . . . .	150	26: 54-56 . . . . .	169
15: 28 . . . . .	89, 93	26: 64 . . . . .	150
15: 34 . . . . .	140 <i>ff.</i>	27: 46 . . . . .	140 <i>ff.</i>
Matthew		Luke	
5: 3-12 . . . . .	137 <i>ff.</i>	1: 76 . . . . .	63
5: 17 . . . . .	127	4: 18, 19 . . . . .	73
5: 17, 18 . . . . .	165	6: 20-23 . . . . .	137 <i>ff.</i>
5: 21 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	4	7: 27 . . . . .	63
9: 13 . . . . .	5, 70	8: 10 . . . . .	18
10: 21 . . . . .	51	10: 15 . . . . .	68
10: 35, 36 . . . . .	51		

Luke—Continued	PAGE	John	PAGE
12: 52, 53 . . . . .	51	4: 10-14 . . . . .	98
13: 19 . . . . .	15	5: 37-40 . . . . .	168
13: 18, 19 . . . . .	16	5: 45-47 . . . . .	167
13: 28-30 . . . . .	35	6: 45 . . . . .	94
14: 16 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	35	6: 66 . . . . .	22
20: 9 . . . . .	29	7: 38 . . . . .	97
20: 17 . . . . .	39	9: 39 . . . . .	18
20: 18 . . . . .	84, 85	10: 25 . . . . .	24
20: 42, 43 . . . . .	43	10: 34 . . . . .	99
21: 22 . . . . .	146	12: 38 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	112
21: 26 . . . . .	146	12: 40 . . . . .	18
21: 27 . . . . .	147	13: 18 . . . . .	102
22: 21 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	106	Chapters xiii. to xvii. .	103
22: 37 . . . . .	88	15: 22-24 . . . . .	23
22: 69 . . . . .	150	15: 25 . . . . .	108
23: 46 . . . . .	142	18: 1 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	169

## THE OLD TESTAMENT

Daniel	PAGE	Malachi	PAGE
2: 34-45 . . . . .	84	3: 1 . . . . .	63
4: 9 [12] . . . . .	15, 16	Micah	
7: 13 . . . . .	147	7: 6 . . . . .	51
8: 10 . . . . .	147	Psalms	
9: 27 . . . . .	144 <i>ff.</i>	8: 7 . . . . .	43
12: 1 . . . . .	146	22: . . . . .	141
Ezekiel		22: 2 . . . . .	140
17: 23 . . . . .	15, 16	31: 5 . . . . .	142
Hosea		35: 19 . . . . .	108
6: 6 . . . . .	70	41: 10 . . . . .	102
Isaiah		69: 5 . . . . .	108
5: 1, 2 . . . . .	29	82: 6 . . . . .	99
6: 9 <i>ff.</i> . . . . .	18, 21	104: 12-17 . . . . .	15
8: 14, 15 . . . . .	84	104: 16 . . . . .	17
14: 13-15 . . . . .	68	110: 1 . . . . .	43
29: 13 . . . . .	54	118: 22, 23 . . . . .	39
53: 12 . . . . .	88	Zechariah	
54: 13 . . . . .	94	9: 9 . . . . .	172
61: 1, 2 . . . . .	73	11: 7, 8 . . . . .	58
66: 24 . . . . .	61	11: 15-17 . . . . .	58
Jeremiah		13: 7-9 . . . . .	57, 59
6: 21 . . . . .	86		





DATE DUE

~~FACULTY~~  
~~FACULTY~~

~~MAY 20 1977~~

~~REF. 11~~

~~100~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



BS2387 .M14

Jesus and the prophets; an historical,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00012 8183